DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 578 EA 005 259

AUTHOR	Brown, Lance Jay; Whiteman, Dorothy E.
TITLE	Planning and Design Workbook for Community Participation: An Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	Princeton Univ., N.J. School of Architecture and Urban Planning.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	51p.
AVAILABLE FROM	School of Architecture and Urban Planning, Research Center for Urban and Environmental Planning, Architecture Building, Princeton, New Jersey 08540 (Free)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Change; *Community Development; *Community Involvement; Community Organizations; Community Programs; Housing; Neighborhood Improvement; *Planned Community; Program Attitudes; Program Design; *Program Evaluation; Program Planning; *Surveys; Urban Renewal; Workbooks

ABSTRACT

The workbook which was the subject of this evaluation was prepared to aid disenfranchised community groups participate in the nonprofessional planning and decisionmaking process. It was written at a time when extensive technical assistance to local groups concerned with community planning and housing situations was envisioned. The intent behind this evaluation was to determine the extent to which the workbook methods and materials were applied, the areas in which they were most useful; and to identify necessary revisions and directions requiring further research. The report summarizes in outline form the exact nature of the replies and presents the critical commentary offered by respondents. Appendixes provide more extensive information from questionnaire responses and summarize the workbook. (Author/DN)

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPY
RIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
School of Architecture &
Urban Planning, Princeton
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE
OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION
OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PER
MISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Copyright © 1973 by
School of Architecture and
Urban Planning
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 078578

Planning and Design Workbook for Community Participation:
An Evaluation Report

Lance Jay Brown, Project Director
Adjunct Professor, Research Associate, School of Architecture and Environmental Studies, The City College of the City University of New York
formerly: Assistant Professor of Architecture and Urban Planning, Princeton University

Dorothy E. Whiteman, Project Co-Director
Assistant Director, Research Center for Urban and Environmental Planning, School of Architecture and Urban Planning, Princeton University

EA 005 259

Research Center for Urban and Environmental Planning
Princeton University School of Architecture and Urban Planning
1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Acknowledgments

We wish to express our appreciation to the University Committee on Research in the Humanities and Social Sciences, and to the School of Architecture and Urban Planning, for grants in support of this research.

We are grateful to Robert L. Geddes, Dean, School of Architecture and Urban Planning, Princeton University, for interest in the work; Bernard P. Spring, Dean, School of Architecture and Environmental Studies, The City College of the City University of New York, for encouragement, suggestions, and materials; Nancy B. Christiansen for secretarial services; and P. Randolph Hill '72 for research assistance.

Lance Jay Brown
Dorothy E. Whiteman

January 1972

Note:
A summary description of the **Planning and Design Workbook for Community Participation** appears in A.7. Many respondents to the evaluation survey requested this information.

Contents

1.0 Introduction 1

2.0 Discussion of Data (Evaluation Survey Section 1A: General) 5

3.0 Discussion of Commentary (Evaluation Survey Section 1B: Commentary; Criticism; New Research) 9
3.1 Problems with the Participatory Process 9
3.2 Communications and Information 10
3.3 Complexity 12
3.4 Planning and Design Innovation; Development and Implementation 12
3.5 User Needs and Desires; Standards; User Satisfaction 13
3.6 General Educational Aspects 14
3.7 Problems of Typology; Scale, Process and Programs 14

4.0 Conclusions (Revisions; Amplification; New Research) 17
4.1 Form 17
4.2 Content 18

Appendices

A.1 Survey Questionnaire and Data 21
A.1.a. Letter of 1 September 1971 Accompanying Questionnaire 22
A.1.b. Survey Questionnaire: Data on Responses 23
A.1.c. Pre-Survey Tally of Workbook Distribution, 20 March 1971 25

A.2 Supporting Information Submitted by Alan Mallach 27

A.3 Specific Information Requested 29
A.3.a. New 'Sample Issues and Policies' to be Investigated 29
A.3.b. Additional Planning and Design Standards to be Researched 30

A.4 Projects, by Type, Aided by Workbook Method or Materials 31

A.5 New Applications of Workbook Method or Materials 41

A.6 Suggested Materials of Interest 45

A.7 Summary Description of the Planning and Design Workbook for Community Participation, **Prepared by Bernard P. Spring** 49
A.7.a. Reviews of the Workbook 51

1.0

Introduction

This document presents the results of the first evaluation of the use of the **Planning and Design Workbook for Community Participation.** Its innovative planning and design method and tools for nonprofessional decision-making were developed at the Princeton University Research Center for Urban and Environmental Planning, School of Architecture and Urban Planning, during the period 1967 to 1969.

The intent behind the evaluation was to determine the extent to which the Workbook methods and materials were applied, the areas in which they were most useful, and the practicability of the explicit method which emphasizes community group participation, as well as to identify necessary revisions and future directions requiring further research. Also of interest was the degree to which application of the Workbook's suggested procedures proved successful.

The report was published in limited quantity in September 1969, was reprinted twice due to demand for copies and was out of print the latter part of March 1971.* Complimentary copies were distributed by the sponsor, the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs. The Research Center sold 1100 copies to 850 individuals and organizations, 100 of whom were unknown due to bookstore sales and distribution to libraries. Evaluation questionnaires were mailed in September 1971 to the 750 individuals and organizations identified, but 50 of these Workbook owners were never reached due to change of address. The questionnaire was completed and returned by 300 persons, or approximately 40%, by the cut-off date. In statistical terms, this return on a mailing survey is considered high.

The evaluation survey, reproduced on
designed to (1) determine reasons for
(2) elicit information about the types
in terms of design method and techni
criticism of the Workbook as a step to
and (4) solicit suggestions as to how g
planning and design procedures in the
by the Workbook or other materials, s
issues, standards, and catalogues. Requ
information indicating which parts of
helpful, how the specific materials we
for what types of projects. Individual
evaluated, although this might be und
In terms of actual projects, it is doubt
reached the construction stage in the
Workbook was published.

The extent of the questionnaire retur
of the Workbook exceeded the expect
tors. This report summarizes in outlin
of the replies, and presents the critical
by the respondents.

The appendices include: A.1, data on
porting information; A.3, issues and s
the respondents; A.4, a categorized lis
identified which employed the Workb
A.5, actual or suggested new uses and
planning and design methods, techni
tion; A.6, a list of materials suggested
for Workbook users (offered for inclu

* Xerographic copies are now available from University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.

Introduction

This document presents the results of the first evaluation of the use of the **Planning and Design Workbook for Community Participation**. Its innovative planning and design method and tools for nonprofessional decision-making were developed at the Princeton University Research Center for Urban and Environmental Planning, School of Architecture and Urban Planning, during the period 1967 to 1969.

The intent behind the evaluation was to determine the extent to which the Workbook methods and materials were applied, the areas in which they were most useful, and the practicability of the explicit method which emphasizes community group participation, as well as to identify necessary revisions and future directions requiring further research. Also of interest was the degree to which application of the Workbook's suggested procedures proved successful.

The report was published in limited quantity in September 1969, was reprinted twice due to demand for copies and was out of print the latter part of March 1971.* Complimentary copies were distributed by the sponsor, the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs. The Research Center sold 1100 copies to 850 individuals and organizations, 100 of whom were unknown due to bookstore sales and distribution to libraries. Evaluation questionnaires were mailed in September 1971 to the 750 individuals and organizations identified, but 50 of these Workbook owners were never reached due to change of address. The questionnaire was completed and returned by 300 persons, or approximately 40%, by the cut-off date. In statistical terms, this return on a mailing survey is considered high.

The evaluation survey, reproduced on pages 23 and 24, was designed to (1) determine reasons for obtaining the report, (2) elicit information about the types of users and their needs in terms of design method and techniques, (3) obtain user's criticism of the Workbook as a step toward filling these needs, and (4) solicit suggestions as to how general and participatory planning and design procedures in the future might be aided by the Workbook or other materials, such as new problems, issues, standards, and catalogues. Requested in parallel was information indicating which parts of the report were most helpful, how the specific materials were used, if at all, and for what types of projects. Individual projects were not evaluated, although this might be undertaken at a later date. In terms of actual projects, it is doubtful that many have reached the construction stage in the two years since the Workbook was published.

The extent of the questionnaire returns and the stated use of the Workbook exceeded the expectations of the evaluators. This report summarizes in outline form the exact nature of the replies, and presents the critical commentary offered by the respondents.

The appendices include: A.1, data on all responses; A.2, supporting information; A.3, issues and standards initiated by the respondents; A.4, a categorized list of the projects identified which employed the Workbook in part or in depth; A.5, actual or suggested new uses and directions related to planning and design methods, techniques, tools, or information; A.6, a list of materials suggested as further reference for Workbook users (offered for inclusion in revised editions

ble
Arbor,

or newsletters); and A.7, a summary description of the Workbook.

While this survey report was reaching completion, Charles Zucker, a member of the Urban Research Group, School of Architecture and Environmental Studies, The City College of the City University of New York, was preparing a paper for the third Environmental Design Research Association Conference to be held in January 1972, describing one of the more successful applications of the Workbook's participatory methodology and tools. The proceedings of the EDRA 3/AR 8 Conference should be consulted for this detailed case study.

Before presenting the results of the survey, three aspects relating to the Workbook require attention. The first relates to the general ability or inability to carry out participatory planning procedures; the second is the demand for explicit, rationalized methods and procedures, as applied to planning and design situations in actual projects, as educational techniques, or as research resource, and third is the value of the information and tools contained in the report. These are discussed in sequence below:

1. The **Planning and Design Workbook for Community Participation** was prepared with an emphasis on aiding disenfranchised community groups primarily desiring, and often required by government programs, to participate in the nonprofessional planning and design decision-making process. In terms of goal achievement, it proffered no guarantees but offered these citizens the opportunity to understand what planning was all about in their own backyards. After two years of research, encouraged by the then pregnant Model Cities legislation, it was assumed that nationwide support would be given to participatory planning methods and procedures. It was anticipated, optimistically perhaps, that this support would take the form of time, money and, primarily, **committed technical assistance** to local groups concerned with various community planning and housing design situations. 'For a full-scale program, the state would probably train a corps of technical assistants. In choosing these aides, the value of technical expertise would have to be balanced against the value of familiarity with the locale...a representative from the community could go through a special training program and return to the group to handle technical details and records,' so reported John Morris Dixon in his detailed review of the Workbook in the **Architectural Forum**, December 1969. Mr. Dixon noted: 'Although
is explained in laymen's terms, the
that the technical group will proba
trained adviser--whether assistant o
consultant.'

Only meager support materialized,
objectives of the original Workbook
considerably short-circuited. Other
in elected government officials at t
levels resulting in alterations in init
impinged on both general planning
and the use of Workbook-type mat
provided in A.2 by the description
State Department of Community A
and after the completion of the Wo
significant outcome of the de-emph
the government level in explicit and
cedures was that it was left to a sel
dividuals and organizations* to pro
money, and manpower, to carry ou
time-consuming, and often frustrat
in issue identification, policy-maki
alternative plans and designs, and p
reports. The socio-political ramifica
planning' were then, and still are, b
their practical value, and this poses
on the success of participatory pro
Dixon, in his review of the Workbo
Forum, made this statement based
views: 'Several architects involved i
planning assert that community gr
told what they need; they want to
need.' Conversely, one respondent
questionnaire, the planning and de
development land agency, voiced a
several others: 'Most of the decisio
to spend the time to educate comm
community groups want to exercis
knowledge...'.

The Workbook was neither publish
nor distributed adequately to direc
number of community groups. In s
groups had access to the material,
often limited by the lack of time,
most important, technical assistan
Yet a significant number of local a

*Local government agencies, community groups, private nonprofit housing sponsors, community design centers, and private architects, planners, lawyers, and engineers.

or newsletters); and A.7, a summary description of the Workbook.

While this survey report was reaching completion, Charles Zucker, a member of the Urban Research Group, School of Architecture and Environmental Studies, The City College of the City University of New York, was preparing a paper for the third Environmental Design Research Association Conference to be held in January 1972, describing one of the more successful applications of the Workbook's participatory methodology and tools. The proceedings of the EDRA 3/AR 8 Conference should be consulted for this detailed case study.

Before presenting the results of the survey, three aspects relating to the Workbook require attention. The first relates to the general ability or inability to carry out participatory planning procedures; the second is the demand for explicit, rationalized methods and procedures, as applied to planning and design situations in actual projects, as educational techniques, or as research resource, and third is the value of the information and tools contained in the report. These are discussed in sequence below:

1. The **Planning and Design Workbook for Community Participation** was prepared with an emphasis on aiding disenfranchised community groups primarily desiring, and often required by government programs, to participate in the nonprofessional planning and design decision-making process. In terms of goal achievement, it proffered no guarantees but offered these citizens the opportunity to understand what planning was all about in their own backyards. After two years of research, encouraged by the then pregnant Model Cities legislation, it was assumed that nationwide support would be given to participatory planning methods and procedures. It was anticipated, optimistically perhaps, that this support would take the form of time, money and, primarily, **committed technical assistance** to local groups concerned with various community planning and housing design situations. 'For a full-scale program, the state would probably train a corps of technical assistants. In choosing these aides, the value of technical expertise would have to be balanced against the value of familiarity with the locale...a representative from the community could go through a special training program and return to the group to handle technical details and records,' so reported John Morris Dixon in his detailed review of the Workbook in the **Architectural Forum**, December 1969. Mr. Dixon noted: 'Although every facet of the process is explained in laymen's terms, the Workbook recognizes that the technical group will probably have some kind of trained adviser--whether assistant or professional consultant.'

Only meager support materialized, and the participatory objectives of the original Workbook research were thereby considerably short-circuited. Other events, such as changes in elected government officials at the national and state levels resulting in alterations in initial program priorities, impinged on both general planning and design procedures and the use of Workbook-type materials. An example is provided in A.2 by the description of the New Jersey State Department of Community Affairs just prior to and after the completion of the Workbook. The most significant outcome of the de-emphasis or disinterest at the government level in explicit and participatory procedures was that it was left to a select number of individuals and organizations* to provide their own time, money, and manpower, to carry out the extremely time-consuming, and often frustrating, work of aiding in issue identification, policy-making, preparation of alternative plans and designs, and preparation of program reports. The socio-political ramifications of 'participatory planning' were then, and still are, being questioned as to their practical value, and this poses additional constraints on the success of participatory procedures. John Morris Dixon, in his review of the Workbook in the **Architectural Forum**, made this statement based on extensive interviews: 'Several architects involved in community planning assert that community groups are tired of being **told** what they need; they want to **understand** what they need.' Conversely, one respondent to the evaluation questionnaire, the planning and design director of a redevelopment land agency, voiced an opinion shared by several others: 'Most of the decision makers don't want to spend the time to educate community groups, and community groups want to exercise power and not knowledge...'.

The Workbook was neither published in ample quantity nor distributed adequately to directly reach a significant number of community groups. In some cases where citizen groups had access to the material, its effectiveness was often limited by the lack of time, money and, perhaps most important, technical assistance in guiding the process. Yet a significant number of local and state agencies, com-

*community groups, sponsors, community architects, planners,

munity groups, nonprofit housing sponsors, private planners, architects, and related professionals who obtained the report made extensive and successful use of it in their work which included, in relative terms, a large percentage of participatory projects listed in A.4.

In at least one instance where technical assistance was made available, the planning and design sequence has been successful. As The Reverend William Linder, Administrator of Queen of Angels parish, Newark, New Jersey, relates: 'Mr. Harry L. Hines undertook a Ford Foundation internship for one year and acquired background and skills in planning, design, and housing development, has gone into the local Newark community and, with the aid of Workbook materials, has undertaken an ongoing lay (adult) group education program, and provides technical assistance to a substantial Newark nonprofit housing corporation.' Available, or ongoing, adult education programs might also be considered a precondition or parallel activity in any participatory activities.

Recent issues of **HUD Newsletter**, published by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, report several significant projects underway. The National Urban League received a $500,000 demonstration grant from HUD to help certain citizen groups involved in the urban renewal process. The League will provide technical assistance to groups of local residents, known as Project Advisory Committees, in urban renewal project areas with predominantly minority population. The Committees play a substantial role in renewal planning and execution (Vol.2:No.37, October 11, 1971). The South Arsenal Neighborhood Development Corporation, composed of residents of an urban renewal project area, has been tentatively designated as the redeveloper of the renewal project. SAND has been functioning as the citizen participation group in the project area for two years. The Corporation has made a number of redevelopment proposals for the residential reuse renewal project which reflect the desires and needs of the residents (Vol.2:No.16, May 17, 1971). Ford Foundation support for the Rural Housing Alliance now totals $800,000. The RHA works on the problem of better housing for the rural poor, and Indian reservations are included in the program. The Alliance conducts a program of research, publications, and technical assistance; substantial support for its technical assistance projects had been provided by the Office of Economic Opportunity (Vol.2:No.35, September 27, 1971). If this kind of support continues, Workbook-type methods may become more useful in the future. Information on available technical assistance services appears in **State Urban Information and Technical Assistance Services**, published by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

2. In the aspect related to the Workbook concerning the demand for explicit methods and procedures, the material proved more positive. The largest number of persons responding stated that they originally obtained the Workbook as a reference, guidebook, or research-type resource, and noted it was successful in that role. It was used in student workshops for programming and design, in offices to train new employees and paraprofessionals, and as a guide for writing other workbooks, guidelines, and explanatory briefs.

3. The final aspect of the survey, to determine the value of information and specific tools, also gave positive results. All of the various parts of the Workbook were used to a significant degree, some for detailed reference and other parts broadly, to guide development of new Workbook-type materials as needed for particular projects. A fair amount of criticism was leveled at some of the materials and tools, but this often took the form of asking for more or updated information, catalogues, and prepared tools, rather than suggesting that use of the material led to failures or adversity.

Survey responses revealed that basically the Workbook was used (1) intensively by a small percentage of technical assistants, professionals, and community groups, and (2) extensively over a long period of time, and as a day-to-day reference or guide in professional practice, research, or teaching. These two groups represent 80% of those who reported that they had used the material. In addition, a number of respondents commented that although no projects were conducted using the outline methodology, this did not necessarily reflect on the value of the Workbook. Other respondents noted that the publication was borrowed repeatedly by persons who could not obtain a copy. The remainder of this report discusses these various groups and their experiences in using the Workbook.

2.0

Discussion of Data
(Evaluation Survey Section 1A: General)

Initially, the evaluation survey of the Workbook was designed as a two-phase undertaking. Owing to limitations of time and manpower, the comprehensive second questionnaire has not yet been implemented. In light of this, no detailed examination of the initial short-form data was undertaken beyond basic tabulations and percentages. A number of inferences and conclusions have been drawn from these initial data. The following discussion, based on 300 completed questionnaires, deals with initial impressions concerning 'general information' on the distribution, use, and criticism of the Workbook.

Question 1: How did you find out about the Planning and Design Workbook for Community Participation?

Over 55% of the respondents acquired the Workbook due to favorable reviews or articles in professional journals. The original intent that the Workbook would be available through state agencies proved almost insignificant: 2.4% cited referral through government agencies, despite the fact that 30% of the total number of respondents represented government agencies on the national, state, regional and local levels (see Question 13).

The second largest group, 24.2%, responsible for publicizing the assistance offered in the report were friends and/or colleagues of Workbook users.

Since the largest group of respondents were professional architects, planners, university professors, and members of city agencies, it can be assumed that the distribution to lay community groups was greatly hampered by a lack o
directed at these groups. Critically, 10% of the t
of Workbook copies published were received by
New Jersey for distribution to various communi
around the state and were impossible to trace; o
indicate that they never reached the field. Distri
material without providing technical assistance
ment it might have been in error, hence a qualifi
the holdback.

However, 20% of the respondents represent non
ing sponsors, citizens' groups, and concerned in
indicating that a significant number of lay group
did find out about and acquire the Workbook. A
the fact that many professionals and governmen
used the Workbook with their individual and/or
clients, referentially or in depth, a large number
tory projects were exposed to the method and r

**Question 2: For what purpose did you originall
Workbook?**
**Question 4: In what way have you found the W
useful?**

These two sets of responses give the clearest indi
was 'expected' from the Workbook method and
trate a sharp difference between the research tea
and the eventual recipient's applications. Some 5
respondents acquired the Workbook as a referen
guidebook related to professional practice in co
who stated a need for explicit procedures enabli

Discussion of Data
(Evaluation Survey Section 1A: General)

Initially, the evaluation survey of the Workbook was designed as a two-phase undertaking. Owing to limitations of time and manpower, the comprehensive second questionnaire has not yet been implemented. In light of this, no detailed examination of the initial short-form data was undertaken beyond basic tabulations and percentages. A number of inferences and conclusions have been drawn from these initial data. The following discussion, based on 300 completed questionnaires, deals with initial impressions concerning 'general information' on the distribution, use, and criticism of the Workbook.

Question 1: How did you find out about the Planning and Design Workbook for Community Participation?

Over 55% of the respondents acquired the Workbook due to favorable reviews or articles in professional journals. The original intent that the Workbook would be available through state agencies proved almost insignificant: 2.4% cited referral through government agencies, despite the fact that 30% of the total number of respondents represented government agencies on the national, state, regional and local levels (see Question 13).

The second largest group, 24.2%, responsible for publicizing the assistance offered in the report were friends and/or colleagues of Workbook users.

Since the largest group of respondents were professional architects, planners, university professors, and members of city agencies, it can be assumed that the distribution to lay community groups was greatly hampered by a lack of publicity directed at these groups. Critically, 10% of the total number of Workbook copies published were received by the State of New Jersey for distribution to various community groups around the state and were impossible to trace; comments indicate that they never reached the field. Distributing the material without providing technical assistance to implement it might have been in error, hence a qualification for the holdback.

However, 20% of the respondents represent nonprofit housing sponsors, citizens' groups, and concerned individuals, indicating that a significant number of lay groups or persons did find out about and acquire the Workbook. Allowing for the fact that many professionals and government agencies used the Workbook with their individual and/or collective clients, referentially or in depth, a large number of participatory projects were exposed to the method and materials.

Question 2: For what purpose did you originally acquire the Workbook?
Question 4: In what way have you found the Workbook most useful?

These two sets of responses give the clearest indication of what was 'expected' from the Workbook method and tools, and illustrate a sharp difference between the research team's objectives and the eventual recipient's applications. Some 50.2% of the respondents acquired the Workbook as a reference and/or guidebook related to professional practice in contrast to 21.8% who stated a need for explicit procedures enabling community

participation. Therefore it is not surprising that 42% of the respondents found the Workbook most useful as a reference or guide, while only 18.1% commented on its assistance in a participatory situation. Additional reactions help to qualify this response since the participatory situations often broke down before the Workbook material could be brought to bear, a reflection on the state of participatory planning arts rather than upon the usability of specific planning and design tools (see Conclusions, 4.2 Content, 6). As one respondent commented, 'Although no projects were conducted, this does not reflect on the value of the Workbook.'

The third largest percentage for original acquisition in a specific category was the need for a reference related to research, 17.7%, and in this category there was a slightly higher indication in actual usefulness, 21.2%.

Of the 11.9% who stated a need for a teaching tool in colleges and universities, 10.2% used the material for that purpose.

Of the 30% who acquired the Workbook out of general interest or curiosity, 21.2% perused it in that fashion.

Owing to multiple answers there was some degree of overlap in the above responses to Workbook use, 293 returns, 342 responses.

Question 3: Have you made use of the Workbook methods and/or tools?

As with the correlation made between answers in Questions 2 and 4, the largest percentage of users, 68.9%, utilized the Workbook as a reference and guide over a broad range of activities (see A.4). The list includes regional and state planning activities, city agency and local community programs, professional practice planning and design situations, as well as pedagogical projects introduced through thesis and research work. The material was applied in many new ways, discussed under Question 8.

Extensive use of the outline method, tools, and prepared forms in an actual working participatory manner was limited to 5.8% of the Workbook owners. Extensive group planning and/or explicit procedures were greatly limited due to two basic reasons: first, lack of emphasis by administrative resources (people, time, and money); second, the serious difficulties in the organization of community action groups that touch on questions of motivation, stimulation, communication, group dynamics, frustration, time, interest, responsibility, and political control.

A total of 17.4% stated that no use could be made of the Workbook. This should be qualified since some respondents commented that it was acquired only for comparative purposes for research, or that lack of funds or time curtailed the use of the Workbook. This group represents a significant number of nonusers whose needs might be identified and fulfilled by other materials.

Question 7: Did you use the Workbook method with a participatory group (a decision-making body composed of a significant number of users, user group representatives, professionals, etc.)?

Some 18.4% of those responding to the question used the Workbook material with an actual group in projects: 11.9% real projects, 6.5% students projects or test cases. This balances more favorably than the assessment of extensive versus partial use in Question 3, where only 5.8% cited extensive use. It may be inferred that even as reference or guidance material the Workbook was utilized in participatory procedures to some significant degree.

An additional 18.1% used the Workbook as an in-house method for small team projects in public and professional office situations or in student or research work.

Of the total respondents, 54.3% did not employ the materials in any form of group decision-making experiences. Some 36.5% of the respondents used the material in either extensive group or individual decision-making activities.

Question 8: Have you used the Workbook method, outline, or tools in any new way, that is, applied to different types of problems than those discussed in the Workbook?

Of the respondents who answered the question, 43 applied the Workbook method, outline, or materials to new problems, often more than one 'new-type' per response (see A.5).

This highly valuable aspect of the Workbook points up the potential of the explicit process and method as procedure transferable to different problem areas. The identified process, which is similiar to traditional implicit procedures, when made explicit becomes useable and constructive across a broad range of planning, design, educational and research activities.

New applications of the Workbook method result in the development of new tools for planning and design. There are in existence expanded glossaries, outline issues and policies for school district planning, additional forms for industrial planning, extended catalogues for housing, and beginning catalogues for industrial development. It would be useful if this material were coordinated through a clearinghouse.

Question 9: How many copies of the Workbook did your group acquire?

A total of 80.2% acquired only one copy of the report. This factor alone would have made broad participation difficult, unless independent owners reproduced parts of the material or composed supplementary material for use in a group context. Indications are that the single copy was used as a reference and guidebook.

From 2 to 10 copies were acquired by 12.3%; this is more than twice the number of respondents who used the material extensively.

Purchasers of more than 10 Workbooks were intermediary distributors, and every attempt was made to trace the recipients to ascertain opinions of the users.

Question 10: How many projects (programs developed, research, student projects, etc.) have actually been executed with the aid of the Workbook (method, catalogues, tools, instructions, etc.)?

The 35.9% who stated that the Workbook material had been useful in projects reported a minimum of 253 and a possible maximum of 454 projects employed the Workbook in their execution. These include actual planning and design projects, and research and education projects. In the categorical breakdown of this question, the largest percentage of respondents, 18.1%, used the material on from 2 to 5 projects. This indicates a degree of satisfaction with the materials and the probability of continued use on future projects. The second largest percentage, 14.7%, used it on only one project, suggesting that a less than equal amount found it helpful, used it once, and may or may not use it again. In written commentary, an additional 10% of the respondents expressed expectation of use in the future on projects not yet started or just getting underway.

Of the 293 respondents to this question, 44.7% made no significant use of the material in fully executed endeavors, but may have referred to the material parenthetically (see Question 4).

Question 11: How long have you had the Workbook in your possession?

The Workbook was published in the late summer of 1969. It was acquired within the first year after publication by 89% of the survey respondents, and by 8.9% from October 1970 to March 1971. The supply of the Workbook was exhausted in March 1971, and more than 100 requests for it were received by December 31, 1971.

Question 12: Which part(s) of the Workbook did you find useful to you in your activities?

The Workbook was prepared and issued in four discrete parts: I. Planning and Design Aids; II. Community Activity Planning; III. Site Planning; IV. Dwelling Unit Design.

There was a 127% shifting overlap in the total responses (378/293) to the question of use of different parts. Parts I and II had an equal amount of use, about 30% of the respondents indicating use of each section. Part III, Site Planning, was cited by 37.5% of the users, and Part IV, Dwelling Unit Design, by 26.3%.

Commentary and criticism appear in Section 3.0.

Question 13: Which of the following do you represent? (Who used the Workbook?)

The largest group of respondents were professionals: architects and urban designers represented 39.6% of the total overlapped 156.4% of responses to other questions (458/293). Following this group were: 20.1% planners; 22.9% university professors, researchers and administrators; and 18.1% city agencies (Model Cities, planning departments, housing authorities, etc.). Nonprofit housing sponsors and citizens' groups totaled 12%; concerned individuals 8.5%; and private developers and corporations 7.5%. Other Workbook owners are listed in the data table in A.1.c.

These figures seem to confirm the distribution procedures and results: major reviews in professional journals yielded a large professional audience. Comments on the returned eval-

uation forms suggest that the Workbook material did filter through these firms and other receptors to community-based clients and organizations, indicated by the project lists in A.4 and A.5.

Question 14: In what geographic area(s) do you normally operate or provide services?

Although intended to reveal broad categorical use, this question cannot be taken at face value. First, the degree of overlap is almost 100%; second, the number of respondents who found it difficult to categorize their activities by the given headings suggested a finer grain was necessary. The range went from a low-density Indian reservation to the largest standard metropolitan statistical area.

The urban 66.2% and suburban 51.2% represented the heaviest geographic areas; rural areas were represented by 24.2%; regions, 13.7%. As the Workbook, vis-a-vis the catalogues, was geared towards central city problems, its use was greatest there. However, respondents from small cities with populations ranging from 50,000 to 80,000 found it difficult to categorize themselves as 'dense urban' or 'inner city core'. There seemed an obvious need for certain types of material (issues, policies, catalogues) geared towards smaller, less dense areas with other than major metropolitan problems and different needs in terms of participation, as discussed in Section 3.0.

The above section represents a limited analysis based on raw data received. All the data will be available at the Princeton University Research Center for Urban and Environmental Planning for detailed statistical analysis if deemed necessary in the future. The numerical and percent readout is reproduced in A.1.

3.0

Discussion of Commentary
(Evaluation Survey Section 1B: Commentary; Criticism; New Research)

This section describes and investigates the written responses to the open-ended questions and the comments requested as part of the evaluation questionnaire. Approximately 60% of the respondents were enough concerned with the acceptability of the Workbook intentions to provide constructive criticism, negative reactions, and commentary which, with respect to the overall evaluation endeavor, now appears invaluable in terms of future revisions, directions, and access to new methods and tools. The myriad of comments has been categorized by subject type and an attempt has been made to develop the subject types in broad discussion categories. The great number of comments precluded inclusion of each one. However, the aim was to identify all major problems, needs, and objections related to the method and materials, and to derive trends and future objectives for research based on these trends. Material listed in A.3, A.4, and A.5 comes from the questionnaire returns. Material cited in A.6 was selected primarily by the evaluation team, augmented by information provided by respondents.

3.1

Problems with the Participatory Process

As the Workbook emphasis was on nonprofessional participation in planning and design, these findings are dealt with first. However, bear in mind the introductory comments concerning encouragement of community participation, also refer to following categories which may not justify but do clarify findings in light of alternat material.

In a number of instances respondents were begun with the intention to emp participatory methods, but the partic of the funding program was changed most cases abandonment was necessit time to educate lay group members o proposals, and a dearth of technical a the process.

The respondents raised a number of b ing roadblocks to group participation volved around general aspects of grou stimulation, endurance, problems of l communications techniques, and ques community organization as a socio-p

Although the Workbook presented a community participation in planning claimed to deal with the equally, if n problem of socio-political community number of respondents considered th to this problem an inadequacy. Motiv are seen as two of the most difficult p before any planning or design can beg come to the meeting, the battle is hal respondent put it, and he continued t must be **replaced** by guided mobility (our emphasis). More work might be

*For an in-depth discussion of the success and failure of citizen participation in socio-political activity, housing, etc., see: **Citizen Participation: A Review of the Literature,** by Judith V. May, Council of Planning Librarians Exchange Bibliography No. 210-No. 211, listed in A.6. The dilemma of 'people who participate more receive more' is contrasted with 'people who receive more participate more;' case studies are included, such as the Newark Housing Council versus Newark Model Cities program conflict; and the broad summaries of (1) motivation literature and (2) capability are indispensable.

Discussion of Commentary
(Evaluation Survey Section 1B: Commentary; Criticism; New Research)

This section describes and investigates the written responses to the open-ended questions and the comments requested as part of the evaluation questionnaire. Approximately 60% of the respondents were enough concerned with the acceptability of the Workbook intentions to provide constructive criticism, negative reactions, and commentary which, with respect to the overall evaluation endeavor, now appears invaluable in terms of future revisions, directions, and access to new methods and tools. The myriad of comments has been categorized by subject type and an attempt has been made to develop the subject types in broad discussion categories. The great number of comments precluded inclusion of each one. However, the aim was to identify all major problems, needs, and objections related to the method and materials, and to derive trends and future objectives for research based on these trends. Material listed in A.3, A.4, and A.5 comes from the questionnaire returns. Material cited in A.6 was selected primarily by the evaluation team, augmented by information provided by respondents.

3.1

Problems with the Participatory Process

As the Workbook emphasis was on nonprofessional participation in planning and design, these findings are dealt with first. However, bear in mind the introductory comments concerning encouragement of community participation, also refer to following categories which may not justify but do clarify findings in light of alternative applications of the material.

In a number of instances respondents reported that projects were begun with the intention to employ the Workbook's participatory methods, but the participation component of the funding program was changed or abandoned. In most cases abandonment was necessitated by a lack of time to educate lay group members or to submit housing proposals, and a dearth of technical assistance to aid in the process.

The respondents raised a number of broad issues concerning roadblocks to group participation. These issues revolved around general aspects of group motivation and stimulation, endurance, problems of language familiarity, communications techniques, and questions of overall community organization as a socio-political problem.*

Although the Workbook presented a method and tools for community participation in planning and design, it never claimed to deal with the equally, if not more, difficult problem of socio-political community organization. A number of respondents considered the lack of attention to this problem an inadequacy. Motivation and organization are seen as two of the most difficult preconditions to set before any planning or design can begin...'once the people come to the meeting, the battle is half over' is how one respondent put it, and he continued to say 'physical planning must be **replaced** by guided mobility and social planning' (our emphasis). More work might be done in this area but

uccess and
ocio-polit-
tizen
erature,
ning
No. 210-
a of
ve more'
eive more
included,
cil versus
flict; and
ition
dispensable.

ultimately at a local level, with socio-political action taking precedent over methods and tools originating at a research center (see note, page 9). Such preconditions should not necessarily **replace** physical planning but **guide** it. Similarly, if the use of a Workbook is 'seen with reticence by action groups who see in it a manipulative instrument and by government bodies who see in it a help for the adversaries of their plans', no degree of revision would make it more acceptable.

A number of respondents considered the volumes overbalanced on the side of the 'physical planning and design' rather than the 'process of participation'; and again it should be emphasized that without technical assistance the Workbook cannot serve all masters. Techniques are available which discuss problems of group dynamics, group interaction, and community organization, and these should be consulted. There are parallel techniques for guiding these processes including 'Synetics', 'Charrette', and workshops, which technical assistants (paraprofessional planners and community organizers) should bring with them to a community.

Growing out of these critiques is the necessity to reference additional participation-organization materials in some form within the Workbook so that lay members of a community group will have sources to tap. But even this will not guarantee stimulation or motivation, only provide the means to order it. In 1969 Alan Mallach, then with the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs, emphasized: 'The Workbook cannot be distributed blind, with no guidance,' and Harry Quintana, of the Real Great Society Urban Design Studio in New York, stated: 'What they really need is a guide to the political process,' and that the Workbook fails to encourage any 'innovative approach to tackling the bureaucracy' (see Workbook review, **Architectural Forum,** December 1969, page 38). The objective of the report was to enable groups who **had organized** to begin to act objectively and positively in their own interests and in specific areas. The Workbook is a device intended to affect the ability to deal with basic issues going beyond rhetoric where there is a lack of expertise and knowledge.

Once the role of the Workbook material is understood, its usefulness seemingly increases. Michael Obringer, of the Planning and Development Action Team for the South Bend Model Cities Agency, having found a lack of interest and response to initial planning activities, used the Workbook as a reference during the first projects being dealt with (this, in turn, necessitated by **pressure to produce** and initiate urban renewal and code experiment programs). Action Team activities undertaken thereafter emphasized prior citizen education, especially in decision making, and Obringer stated, 'We now are beginning to get involved on specific projects and hope to use the method as an aid...', the preconditions having been set.

Some respondents suggested that shorter, more limited problems be dealt with first as an introduction to the process, method, and materials.

In summary, it appears that Part I, Planning and Design Aids, and Part II, Community Activity Planning, could include outline methods and references for aiding motivation, stimulation, and community organizations, but this should not be seen as the major goal of the Workbook.

3.2

Communications and Information

A large number of respondents made constructive comments on the combined nature and degree of the communications and information transfer contained in the Workbook. Approximately 20% of the respondents were concerned with the exact matter of communications techniques, although many considered the method an excellent description of the process of planning and design and used it as an explanatory tool with client communities and related professionals and students. These are discussed below under the headings: Size and Layout, Graphics, Language, Media, and General Information.

Size and Layout

The largest responses in this category related to size of the publication. The Workbook material was poorly presented in terms of its bulk: the 592 pages were distributed as a single package and this was overwhelming for most recipients. Since there are four independent tools they should have been packaged, and perhaps distributed, separately.

The apparent size and complexity of the material could be reduced effectively by incorporating different layout techniques which would still permit a punch-binding but eliminate blank space on the pages, producing more compact volumes.

The amount of repetition in introducing each of the four major parts could be reduced, and perhaps the material rotated 90 degrees for ease of handling.

A summary, in the form of an introduction describing in more general terms the method and materials, would dispense with the necessity of perusing the Workbook to achieve general familiarity with it. This might also aid in selecting which of the four parts of the Workbook one wanted to use.

The most requested aid in using the Workbook was a comprehensive index to the four-part set, including section tabs. It was suggested that a cross-referencing system be incorporated for interrelating the different parts of the Workbook (already partially used between catalogues and issues in independent parts).

Graphics

Layout and size are strongly related to graphics. Initially, the Workbook drawings were to have been augmented with photographic material; this was economically unfeasible at the time. The three-phase diagram technique utilized in the catalogues was an attempt to enable persons of varying visual vocabularies to read graphic material at different levels of abstraction. This emphasis on visual aids could be carried further. One major request was for a graphic chart explaining the whole 'process', as attempted in the instruction for the 'ten steps' in Parts II, III, and IV. Such materials were, in fact, prepared independently by some respondents. Additional 'graphic scales' for various uses were also recommended.

Language

Much time was expended in modifying the language used in the Workbook so that complex professional jargon would be reduced to simple statements. A small number of respondents still found the language difficult to understand. In one case the problem was specifically one of semi-literate or illiterate community members, and videotaped, spoken, or additional graphic means were requested as opposed to text. In another instance, Harry L. Hines, an expert technical assistant in community education and housing development working in Newark, New Jersey, expanded the glossary and distributed it to all group members for use during discussions. It is included in a forthcoming booklet listed in A.6. There is great merit in the desire of many persons to decrease the size of the Workbook and to simplify the material to make it more comprehensible for disadvantaged groups. Placing greater focus on nonverbal communications, and emphasizing general principles in Parts I and II, might aid in this task. However, the Workbook contents obviously need to change, depending on the user, and each user should be given the opportunity to delete what is deemed unnecessary; this is often easier than constructing new materials. Some respondents recommended that the Workbook be translated into a foreign language.

Media

Many suggestions were offered for increasing the use of available media to aid in the motivation and comprehension of the planning process growing out of Workbook methods. These included radio and television dissemination of process and information, the use of videotape to record and review material as well as for educating students and community clients, and additional three-dimensional or operational tools similar to those blueprinted in Workbook Parts II, III, and IV.

In the spring of 1971, members of the original research team prepared a series of television programs explaining the Workbook methods. Little public response was forthcoming through the nascent New Jersey Public Broadcasting System (Channel 52, UHF) and, unfortunately, the videotapes were erased without notice. Additional material using various media should be developed, but a prior investigation should be made to determine the best possible means for distributing such costly material.

General Information

Some respondents thought the Workbook provided excess information or too much specific information. Others found the levels of information inadequate and requested more on catalogue types, examples of more types, and more data on the cost of various types, the programs under which they were built, and the cross-relationships between dwellings and buildings. Although additional information would be useful to some as conservative minutiae, expanding the size of the Workbook would be considered a burden by others. Robert Sangine, an architect with Skidmore, Owings and Merrill in Washington, D.C., noted 'other individual reference sources provide more detailed information, however, the Workbook is useful in that it incorporates a range of generally accepted principles and techniques within **one** reference source.'

A more complete, or companion, revision might include detailed information for those who desire it, perhaps under separate cover by subject in a new format. This also applies to the problem of listing 'sample issues and policies' of planning and planning and design standards, discussed in Section 3.5. The questions of size, detail, and process versus information are summarized in Conclusions, 4.2 Content.

3.3

Complexity

About 10% of those who included commentary and/or criticism of the Workbook discussed the issue of complexity. Respondents indicated that it contained or covered too much material or was overly intricate and required 'a guide to the guide'. It was seen by some to be too long, excessively complex or sophisticated for laymen to use alone; too complicated, thereby losing subtlety; and requiring more time than was available to determine which parts would be applicable in a particular planning and design situation. Conversely, some respondents found this same material oversimplified, or too general or unsophisticated for professional use.

In effect, the two extremes of complexity and simplicity were identified and criticized. As the Workbook was written to help bridge the gap between (1) the nonprofessional (lay), (2) the technical assistant (paraprofessional), and (3) professional groups, it may be unavoidable that the material was found unsatisfactory in one extreme or the other when used by one group alone.

The issue of complexity is seen in combination with possible frustration and wasted time in unnecessary decision-making by community groups. The Workbook instructions do not recommend dealing with peripheral decisions, and material which is unimportant to users must be disregarded.

The matter of complexity or simplicity is tied most critically to the inclusion of a trained professional assistant who, through familiarity with the Workbook, can clarify the process to the lay user group. This requirement cannot be overemphasized.

Discussions in the Introduction about the preconditions of community organization and education might clarify some problems relating to complexity an
mendations for future work noted
Form and 4.2 Content) might simp
ameliorate comprehension of Work

3.4

Planning and Design Innovation; Development and Implementation

A small number of respondents ad
innovation and future orientation
design issues and housing prototyp
lation to selected catalogue types,
sidered new possibilities* but mad
icy decision to present only what
attainable. Innovation, especially a
strata, is often difficult to initiate
generally measured against current
class material standards. There are
against this policy, and there were
the research group regarding the m
tain moderately radical social orga
izations, and technological innovat
denial of such possibilities, and suc
the hands of the individual decisio
consultants. It was assumed that as
ning and design became available a
they would be incorporated into th
ter deserves reconsideration or, as s
Goldfarb, Architect, affiliated with
Society Building Foundation, Phila
people that they are planning for th
If the issue is building housing now
cal improvements now, then you n
specific to the development process
process.' Although it appears that
needs require planning in one form
comments are relevant and suggest
sion in perhaps two directions.

The above commentary and criticis
requests for explanations of 'typica
packages', and the relative roles of
and community groups throughout
development process. 'Part II, Com

*Moshe Safdie's Habitat system in Montreal, proposals by R. Buckminster Fuller, Congres Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne, the Archigram group, the Dome Cookbook, industrialized housing systems, the kibbutz or commune, and both higher- and lower-density environments.

A more complete, or companion, revision might include detailed information for those who desire it, perhaps under separate cover by subject in a new format. This also applies to the problem of listing 'sample issues and policies' of planning and planning and design standards, discussed in Section 3.5. The questions of size, detail, and process versus information are summarized in Conclusions, 4.2 Content.

3.3

Complexity

About 10% of those who included commentary and/or criticism of the Workbook discussed the issue of complexity. Respondents indicated that it contained or covered too much material or was overly intricate and required 'a guide to the guide'. It was seen by some to be too long, excessively complex or sophisticated for laymen to use alone; too complicated, thereby losing subtlety; and requiring more time than was available to determine which parts would be applicable in a particular planning and design situation. Conversely, some respondents found this same material oversimplified, or too general or unsophisticated for professional use.

In effect, the two extremes of complexity and simplicity were identified and criticized. As the Workbook was written to help bridge the gap between (1) the nonprofessional (lay), (2) the technical assistant (paraprofessional), and (3) professional groups, it may be unavoidable that the material was found unsatisfactory in one extreme or the other when used by one group alone.

The issue of complexity is seen in combination with possible frustration and wasted time in unnecessary decision-making by community groups. The Workbook instructions do not recommend dealing with peripheral decisions, and material which is unimportant to users must be disregarded.

The matter of complexity or simplicity is tied most critically to the inclusion of a trained professional assistant who, through familiarity with the Workbook, can clarify the process to the lay user group. This requirement cannot be overemphasized.

Discussions in the Introduction about the preconditions of community organization and education might clarify some problems relating to complexity and process, while recommendations for future work noted in the Conclusions (4.1 Form and 4.2 Content) might simplify presentation and ameliorate comprehension of Workbook-type materials.

3.4

Planning and Design Innovation; Development and Implementation

A small number of respondents addressed the question of innovation and future orientation related to planning and design issues and housing prototypes. As discussed with relation to selected catalogue types, the Workbook group considered new possibilities* but made a time-constrained policy decision to present only what was currently practical and attainable. Innovation, especially at the lower economic strata, is often difficult to initiate because aspirations are generally measured against current and prevailing middle-class material standards. There are obvious arguments against this policy, and there were different opinions among the research group regarding the matter. The deletion of certain moderately radical social organizations, physical organizations, and technological innovation was not seen as a denial of such possibilities, and such decisions were left in the hands of the individual decision-making groups and their consultants. It was assumed that as newer approaches to planning and design became available and broadly **attainable** they would be incorporated into the Workbook. This matter deserves reconsideration or, as stated by Lawrence Goldfarb, Architect, affiliated with The Young Great Society Building Foundation, Philadelphia: 'Explain to people that they are planning for the future, not for now. If the issue is building housing now, or making other physical improvements now, then you need a Workbook more specific to the development process rather than the planning process.' Although it appears that both short- and long-term needs require planning in one form or another, Goldfarb's comments are relevant and suggest further Workbook revision in perhaps two directions.

The above commentary and criticism are reinforced by requests for explanations of 'typical developers' proposal packages', and the relative roles of developer, architect and community groups throughout the total planning and development process. 'Part II, Community Activity

Montreal,
ler, Congres
oderne, the
kbook,
he kibbutz
d lower-

Planning, should move into 'execution' participation as well as goal formulation' was a typical comment.

Further information about the role of the developer and the nature of development activities was requested repeatedly as additional input to the Workbook (see A.3.a).

Robin Riley, Executive Director of Metro Link, Community Design Center, New Orleans, noted: 'It is possible the Workbook could link up with more specific problems...of implementation of designs produced. The Workbook is kind of a planning/architectural equivalent of the **Handbook on Housing Law,** a product of the Earl Warren Legal Institute; it's possible the two might consciously intermesh in any future publications.' Another respondent stated: 'Parts I and II [of the Workbook] should be more specific, and helpful, if they showed how to work better with city and federal agencies,' a pragmatic comment which may operate either sympathetically or antithetically depending on group objectives.

3.5

User Needs and Desires; Standards; User Satisfaction

This discussion combines a group of related concerns raised by survey respondents. The following remark serves well as an introduction: 'The experience of the...project would be instructive--you can give people what they want (or say they want) but this doesn't take you off the hook. They'll criticize you for what you let them do to themselves. This is the dilemma--and it's not well presented.' That comment was received from a combined architecture, planning, social engineering firm. The quotation may be generally true when you **give** people things, but if they participate in determining their own needs they share the responsibility with their chosen professionals. The successful determination of what people want, policies growing out of stated needs and desires, is not guaranteed by any method. New methods can only attempt a closer approximation between initial objectives and final results, via better comprehension and communications.

Generally, standards are determined empirically by society-at-large and transmitted through government funding programs, as cited in the Workbook. Since the revision is often slow and cumberso existing standards can be accepted modified and even rejected.* The la tics, and must be handled on an indi respondents queried the source of s of 'fit' for different ethnic groups. by the above opening comments. In set of standards suits all groups exce guarantee the most basic concerns o and safety. When seen against legisla the varying needs and desires of diff conflict, and policy must be made t separate actions, for the present at l

Concerning the request for addition standards were not cited in the Wor merous. One respondent recommen 'Operation Breakthrough' data and is five times the bulk of the Workbo

Others requested more information planning standards, especially for re is little legislation. The American Pu document entitled **Planning the Neig** published in 1948 by the Public Ad approached a set of usable commun but only as a reference.**

The site planning and dwelling unit Workbook are general, exemplary, a mon language. As more work is don material, additional information on accepted standards will become avai material should be referenced as it i spondents suggested that the standa Workbook be issued separately to b with other planning and design met

There is no guarantee of satisfaction sign venture. The Workbook cannot anxiety, or even possible failure, bu discovering and predicting where ph The determination of user needs is Needs and desires change, resources change. People can only attempt to future social-psychological needs, g and hope for increased satisfaction environment.

*Although most standards are proferred as 'minimum design requirements', they are most often used as maximums or optimums by funding agencies to control costs. It is not likely that these will change before general housing priorities and economies change.

There are many volumes of treatises on the nature of community/neighborhood design, each incorporating and suggesting their own standards based on the author's overall concept of a decent living environment, such as: **Community and Privacy: Toward a New Architecture of Humanism, by Serge Chermayeff and Christopher Alexander, New York: Doubleday, 1963; **Communitas: Means of Livelihood and Ways of Life,** by Percival and Paul Goodman, New York: Vintage Books, 1960; **The Death and Life of Great American Cities,** by Jane Jacobs, New York: Random House, 1961; **La Charte d'Athenes,** by Charles Edouard Jeanneret-Gris (Le Corbusier), Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1957; **Can Our Cities Survive?,** by José Luis Sert, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942; **The Heart of the City: Towards the Humanisation of Urban Life,** edited by J. Tyrwhitt, J. L. Sert, and E. N. Rogers, London: Lund Humphries, 1952; U.S. Government publications controlling Planned Unit Development; the New Communities Act, and others. None of these, nor the books dealing with planning criteria (an example is **Planning Design Criteria,** by Joseph De Chiara and Lee Koppelman in cooperation with the School of Architecture, Pratt Institute, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1969) can present indisputable and universal standards for planning large areas as each large-scale area becomes a new social, political, and economic situation. Such works, extensive as they may be, serve only as broad references for alternative futures. Further revision of the Workbook might incorporate summaries of some of the available approaches for purposes of comparative analysis.

Planning, should move into 'execution' participation as well as goal formulation' was a typical comment.

Further information about the role of the developer and the nature of development activities was requested repeatedly as additional input to the Workbook (see A.3.a).

Robin Riley, Executive Director of Metro Link, Community Design Center, New Orleans, noted: 'It is possible the Workbook could link up with more specific problems...of implementation of designs produced. The Workbook is kind of a planning/architectural equivalent of the **Handbook on Housing Law**, a product of the Earl Warren Legal Institute; it's possible the two might consciously intermesh in any future publications.' Another respondent stated: 'Parts I and II [of the Workbook] should be more specific, and helpful, if they showed how to work better with city and federal agencies,' a pragmatic comment which may operate either sympathetically or antithetically depending on group objectives.

3.5

User Needs and Desires; Standards; User Satisfaction

This discussion combines a group of related concerns raised by survey respondents. The following remark serves well as an introduction: 'The experience of the...project would be instructive--you can give people what they want (or say they want) but this doesn't take you off the hook. They'll criticize you for what you let them do to themselves. This is the dilemma--and it's not well presented.' That comment was received from a combined architecture, planning, social engineering firm. The quotation may be generally true when you **give** people things, but if they participate in determining their own needs they share the responsibility with their chosen professionals. The successful determination of what people want, policies growing out of stated needs and desires, is not guaranteed by any method. New methods can only attempt a closer approximation between initial objectives and final results, via better comprehension and communications.

Generally, standards are determined empirically by society-at-large and transmitted through government funding programs, as cited in the Workbook. Since the machinery for review and revision is often slow and cumbersome, even unresponsive, existing standards can be accepted or, with great difficulty, modified and even rejected.* The latter is a matter of politics, and must be handled on an individual basis. A few of the respondents queried the source of standards and their degree of 'fit' for different ethnic groups. This can only be answered by the above opening comments. In a pluralistic society no set of standards suits all groups except, perhaps, those which guarantee the most basic concerns of health (light and air) and safety. When seen against legislated or required standards the varying needs and desires of different groups often cause conflict, and policy must be made to resolve the conflict as separate actions, for the present at least.

Concerning the request for additional standards--all available standards were not cited in the Workbook; they are too numerous. One respondent recommended incorporation of 'Operation Breakthrough' data and techniques. This material is five times the bulk of the Workbook.

Others requested more information on community activity planning standards, especially for recreation, for which there is little legislation. The American Public Health Association's document entitled **Planning the Neighborhood**, originally published in 1948 by the Public Administration Service, approached a set of usable community planning standards, but only as a reference.**

The site planning and dwelling unit standards cited in the Workbook are general, exemplary, and translated into common language. As more work is done on Workbook-type material, additional information on improved, generally accepted standards will become available, and current material should be referenced as it is identified. Some respondents suggested that the standards sections of the Workbook be issued separately to be used in conjunction with other planning and design methods.

There is no guarantee of satisfaction in any planning or design venture. The Workbook cannot dissolve frustration, anxiety, or even possible failure, but perhaps it can aid in discovering and predicting where physical faults may occur. The determination of user needs is not a static procedure. Needs and desires change, resources change, and standards change. People can only attempt to predict their current and future social-psychological needs, give them physical form, and hope for increased satisfaction with the physical environment.

3.6

General Educational Aspects

Respondents raised a number of questions and offered suggestions concerning education. These ranged from broad issues of educating the community to particular application of the Workbook in elementary and high schools. The following summarizes the commentary:

1. The Workbook might serve as an educational tool for community groups if the necessary time can be so allotted. In general this is difficult, and the whole participatory process is often undermined. If the specific planning process can be preceded by a general education program for decision-makers and group members, positive participation may be enhanced. One respondent stated, 'The Workbook is best **only** as an educational tool for the community--so they can knowledgeably critique plans'; while another noted that 'most decision makers don't want to spend time educating community groups.' Others commented that government programs and practical realities (submission of applications) do not give time for the educational process.

2. The material was found useful in orienting new staff and students (paraprofessionals) in community design centers and private offices, and in educating related professionals and consultants (engineers, sociologists, economists) by professional offices.

3. The material has been used independently by high school students. It was suggested that it be utilized in civic studies in elementary and high schools to generate studies in their specific communities as an introduction to the planning process (pragmatic gaming techniques).

4. The Workbook has had broad and seemingly successful use in a number of colleges with architecture and sociology curricula (see A.4 for regular coursework research and thesis projects using this material). Pedagogically, the Workbook offers an alternative to many implicit program procedures and serves to balance quantitative approaches to planning and design. It does not deny the value of other methods but it serves as a means for understanding the role of 'values' in the process of synthesis, gives an outline for ordering educational objectives, and provides sufficient content to learn about a broad range of urban problems.

Despite these actual and suggested applications, the respondents who found the material too complex (Section 3.3) suggest it probably would need revision for wide application in some of the above areas.

3.7

Problems of Typology; Scale; Process and Programs

'Totally inadequate in rural problem-solving, especially Indian reservations.'

'Really not applicable to our work in suburban communities.'

'Seemed to be oriented toward larger urban areas. Much information is contained in the Workbook and I don't know if expansion would add to its effectiveness--may result in a more cumbersome product. Its value for us has been its systematic arrangement and consideration of issues, etc., rather than the actual contents--it's a problem of scale.'

These comments, along with others, touched on another area that may require more work in the future. The third comment above sums up a paradox in attempting to provide a broad-base action or reference work: it cannot serve all equally well. The suggestion was often made to separate the 'method and process' from the 'content', thereby allowing use of the method and process in any context, with the content being available or developed as necessary. In the case of the Workbook 'as is', the content was specifically oriented towards urban (especially Model Cities) type areas. Difficulty was cited by those who tried to use the **sample** content (issues, catalogue types, standards) in cities with populations of 80,000 and 50,000, and what were described as 'fringe', 'suburban', and 'rural' areas. No explanation for this could suffice, and it was proposed that additional Workbook components or parts might be developed, when necessary, to relate more specifically to various other contexts, situations, or activities. The methods and process outlined should still maintain their integrity and usefulness, although the context or activities have been changed, and comments to this effect were received: '...the handbook was useful in stimulating the beginning of an iterative process.'

Other respondents discussed in detail questions on infill housing, rehabilitation, and available programs for these and other situations including Operation Breakthrough and urban renewal. More research could augment the available information in these areas by identifying and expanding new 'sample issues' to be dealt with, and by identifying or generating new catalogue types and standards. This broad topic is noted in the Conclusions section.

Note: During the preparation of **Princeton University Land Planning and Housing Potentials: A Preliminary Assessment,** published in October 1970, the Research Center for Urban and Environmental Planning research team found a need for more site catalogue types for lower density and Planned Unit Development prototypes. Six additional examples were partially prepared and included in the study. Other examples of individual amplification or revision of content material were reported for other activities. (See section on new applications of Workbook method, A.5.)

4.0

Conclusions
(Revisions; Amplification; New Research)

Many new directions were discovered in the course of this first survey of Workbook recipients. Some of the information received confirms previously known shortcomings of the **Planning and Design Workbook for Community Participation.** What is most encouraging is the desire and commitment on the part of most respondents to continue in pursuit of methods, techniques, and tools which improve our understanding of the planning and design process and continually increase the role and involvement of people who will live in and use the man-made environment. A critical issue to be considered by those interested or engaged in Workbook-type activities is where this work should be done, how it should be funded and who should be responsible for its continuation--research, administration, and dissemination. It has been thought that an independent institute, operating as a research arm and clearinghouse, should be created to conduct these activities.

The general commentary and criticism indicate that the Workbook has been useful and its value could be increased by making certain changes in both its form and content. The outline lists of suggested and inferred changes resulting from the survey are modest and moderate in comparison to material some Workbook recipients have added or changed in the publication. Workbooks have been prepared, and others are underway, which deal with new activity areas (educational planning, industrial development), Workbook sections have been amplified (glossary, issues, catalogues), and new ideas are in the offing. What respondents have expressed is a continued need for ongoing research to revise existing matter and develop new material in activity areas already covered by the Workbook (housing) and in additional activity areas identified (wor ecology, travel), and other activities ment could be dealt with in a fashion As one respondent succinctly stated, **not** a larger Workbook.' Institutions ize in different activities but continu for the coordination and disseminati people to aid in using related metho tools.

In parallel, additional study should b need and desire for participation in p Methods and materials are useful onl awareness of possible action, a need a sibility, a conscious motivation to pa sympathy with the idea of helping pe selves.

Outlined below are suggested and inf ing from this survey evaluation.

4.1

Form

The following changes should be con in comprehension and usability of th

Conclusions
(Revisions; Amplification; New Research)

Many new directions were discovered in the course of this first survey of Workbook recipients. Some of the information received confirms previously known shortcomings of the **Planning and Design Workbook for Community Participation.** What is most encouraging is the desire and commitment on the part of most respondents to continue in pursuit of methods, techniques, and tools which improve our understanding of the planning and design process and continually increase the role and involvement of people who will live in and use the man-made environment. A critical issue to be considered by those interested or engaged in Workbook-type activities is where this work should be done, how it should be funded and who should be responsible for its continuation--research, administration, and dissemination. It has been thought that an independent institute, operating as a research arm and clearinghouse, should be created to conduct these activities.

The general commentary and criticism indicate that the Workbook has been useful and its value could be increased by making certain changes in both its form and content. The outline lists of suggested and inferred changes resulting from the survey are modest and moderate in comparison to material some Workbook recipients have added or changed in the publication. Workbooks have been prepared, and others are underway, which deal with new activity areas (educational planning, industrial development), Workbook sections have been amplified (glossary, issues, catalogues), and new ideas are in the offing. What respondents have expressed is a continued need for ongoing research to revise existing matter and develop new material in activity areas already covered by the Workbook (housing) and in additional activity areas identified (work, leisure, culture, ecology, travel), and other activities in the urbanized environment could be dealt with in a fashion similar to housing. As one respondent succinctly stated, 'More Workbook types--**not** a larger Workbook.' Institutions do exist which specialize in different activities but continued attention is needed for the coordination and dissemination of information, and people to aid in using related methods, information, and tools.

In parallel, additional study should be given to the general need and desire for participation in pluralistic societies. Methods and materials are useful only where there is an awareness of possible action, a need and desire for responsibility, a conscious motivation to participate, and general sympathy with the idea of helping people to help themselves.

Outlined below are suggested and inferred changes resulting from this survey evaluation.

4.1

Form

The following changes should be considered to aid in comprehension and usability of the Workbook:

1. Prepare a separate, short summary of method, process, and instruction for community-wide distribution (completed, see A.7).

2. Review and clarify the language.

3. Prepare a graphic explanation of the method, process, and instructions (wall chart).

4. Research means to revise and reorganize the material into smaller books, and rebind, to distribute specific parts of the Workbook separately, to make its use more selective and reduce the relative bulk of material handled at any one time. This also allows for additional sections to be added, or appended (4.2 Content).

5. Provide more extensive index and tabulation system.

6. Provide more extensive cross-referencing system.

7. Review and revise format (layout and graphics) to make material more flexible, more easily handled.

8. Investigate additional methods of communication (such as videotape and physical tools).

9. Review means of Workbook-type material distribution (clearinghouse, publicity, funding).

4.2

Content

Noted below are areas of new research required or amplification/clarification of existing parts of the Workbook:

1. Review and revise the content of the Workbook to further separate methods and procedures sections from those which are encyclopedic and referential.

2. Review, research, revise, and update the three catalogues in the Workbook, and place additional emphasis on innovation, new directions, and additional contexts (rural, 'fringe', etc.), and scales of projects (both smaller, such as infill housing, rehabilitation, and renovation, and larger, including new communities and Planned Unit Development).

3. Document a 'case study' as a pragmatic example of the process worked through.

One respondent, Charles E. Thomsen, Special Assistant for Design Policy, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, suggested that the experience of the following groups in the development of projects might be included in the Workbook:

'The experience of the New York City Department of Parks in the development of experimental vest-pocket parks.
'New York City's experience in the development of the program for the Brooklyn Expressway, 'Linear City'–'Plan for Planning.' The architect-planners for the project were Rogers, Taliaferro, Kostritsky, and Lamb of Baltimore.
'The 'Ladder of Decision Process' inaugurated in connection with an urban renewal project in Cincinnati in which the planning and design decisions were voted on a step-by-step basis from preliminary abstract concepts to specific items (buildings, etc.) by the client, a formal group that included city officials and agencies, city council representatives, and members of the community. Rogers, Taliaferro, Kostritsky, and Lamb were the architect-planners for this project also.

'The policies of the Boston Redevelopment Authority, Philadelphia, and San Francisco for dealing with works of art in housing and urban development projects.'

4. Review, research, and amplify standards at the three scales dealt with in the Workbook.

5. Extend the Workbook to cover aspects of implementation, **development**, administration, and **project execution** (provide a new, and perhaps separate, section to the four-part publication).

6. Review and research new 'sample issues': general issues identified by Workbook users.

7. Conduct a comparative analysis of laws and regulations affecting community design (codes, zoning ordinances, and procedures) which might serve as a guide in areas of change.

8. Investigate further the general nature of building codes with emphasis on performance requirements (as undertaken for design standards).

9. Review and expand glossary.

10. Review and expand reference bibliography (Books You May Want to Use), with an emphasis on funding programs, information on community organization and participation, and other topics suggested in this report.

A.1

Survey Questionnaire and Data

This appendix presents (a) copy of the letter that accompanied the questionnaire mailed to identified owners of the **Planning and Design Workbook for Community Participation**; (b) the questionnaire, with data on all responses; and (c) a pre-survey tally of the distribution of the Workbook.

A.1.a

Letter of 1 September 1971 Accompanying Questionnaire

1 September 1971

To: Recipients of *Planning and Design Workbook for Community Participation,* prepared for the State of New Jersey Department of Community Affairs by the Research Center for Urban and Environmental Planning, Princeton University School of Architecture and Urban Planning, 1969, 592 pages

From: Lance Jay Brown, Associate, RCUEP; Assistant Professor of Architecture and Urban Planning
Dorothy E. Whiteman, Assistant Director for Documentation, RCUEP

Our Research Center distribution records indicate that you are one of the 1200 individuals or groups who received at least one copy of our publication entitled *Planning and Design Workbook for Community Participation.* We recognize the diversity of interests that prompted requests for the report. Copies went to libraries, research organizations, government agencies, community groups, and students of urban planning and architecture. Requests for the *Workbook* came from more than twenty countries around the world.

There is widespread recognition of the need for evaluation of procedures such as those presented in the *Workbook*: user groups, professionals, and researchers continuously seek such information in order to improve our physical planning procedures.

From the outset of the research that culminated in the *Workbook*, it has been our intention to evaluate the participatory planning process and the effect of the *Workbook* method on practice, reference, and research.

The enclosed questionnaire represents a first phase in this evaluation procedure.

We hope that you will take the time necessary to complete and return the questionnaire. The questions have been phrased to allow for feedback from all sources. The results of this feedback will be forwarded to you as soon as possible.

Your cooperation in contributing to our evaluation survey is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

Lance Jay Brown

Dorothy E. Whiteman

A.1.b

Survey Questionnaire; Data on Responses

The two columns of figures indicate:
Number of responses
Percentage of respondents

1. How did you find out about the Planning and Design Workbook for Community Participation*?*

71	24.2%	Referral through a friend or colleague
7	2.4%	Referral through a professional firm (architect/planner)
7	2.4%	Referral through a government agency (state/local)
165	56.3%	Reviews or articles in journals
45	15.4%	Other (specify)

2. For what purpose did you originally acquire the Workbook? *(check as applicable)*

64	21.8%	Need for an explicit procedure and new techniques enabling community participation
147	50.2%	Need for a source of reference, or guide book, related to professional practice
35	11.9%	Need for a new teaching tool in a college or university
52	17.7%	Need for a reference related to research
88	30.0%	General interest, curiosity
19	6.5%	Other (specify)
		Not applicable

3. Have you made use of the Workbook *methods and/or tools?*

202	68.9%	Yes, partially, i. e., as a reference, guide, catalogue, etc.
17	5.8%	Yes, extensively, i. e., used outline, tools, methods, singly or in a group
51	17.4%	Not at all
26	8.9%	Other (specify)
		Not applicable

4. In what way have you f
most useful? (check as

53	18.1%	Need for an explic techniques enablin
123	42.0%	Need for a source related to professio
30	10.2%	Need for a new tea university
62	21.2%	Need for a referenc
62	21.2%	General interest, c
12	4.1%	Other (specify)
		Not applicable

5. Question misprinted. Re

6. Did you use the Workbo
the planning and design

		Yes (underscore) l planners
24	8.2%	planners
16	5.5%	planners and archi
6	2.0%	architects
4	1.4%	lawyers, engineers, and planners
3	1.0%	planners architects
3	1.0%	planners, architect enginners
3	1.0%	lawyers
2	.7%	lawyers and archit
1	.3%	engineers, architec
1	.3%	engineers and arch
58	19.8%	Yes (write in)
135	46.1%	No
17	5.8%	Other (specify)
		Not applicable

A.1.b

Survey Questionnaire; Data on Responses

cate:

1. How did you find out about the Planning and Design Workbook for Community Participation*?*

71	24.2%	Referral through a friend or colleague
7	2.4%	Referral through a professional firm (architect/planner)
7	2.4%	Referral through a government agency (state/local)
165	56.3%	Reviews or articles in journals
45	15.4%	Other (specify)

2. For what purpose did you originally acquire the Workbook? *(check as applicable)*

64	21.8%	Need for an explicit procedure and new techniques enabling community participation
147	50.2%	Need for a source of reference, or guide book, related to professional practice
35	11.9%	Need for a new teaching tool in a college or university
52	17.7%	Need for a reference related to research
88	30.0%	General interest, curiosity
19	6.5%	Other (specify)
		Not applicable

3. Have you made use of the Workbook *methods and/or tools?*

202	68.9%	Yes, partially, i. e., as a reference, guide, catalogue, etc.
17	5.8%	Yes, extensively, i. e., used outline, tools, methods, singly or in a group
51	17.4%	Not at all
26	8.9%	Other (specify)
		Not applicable

4. In what way have you found the Workbook *most useful? (check as applicable)*

53	18.1%	Need for an explicit procedure and new techniques enabling community participation
123	42.0%	Need for a source of reference, or guide book, related to professional practice
30	10.2%	Need for a new teaching tool in a college or university
62	21.2%	Need for a reference related to research
62	21.2%	General interest, curiosity
12	4.1%	Other (specify)
		Not applicable

5. Question misprinted. Responses deleted.

6. Did you use the Workbook *with others involved in the planning and design process?*

		Yes (underscore) lawyers, engineers, architects, planners
24	8.2%	planners
16	5.5%	planners and architects
6	2.0%	architects
4	1.4%	lawyers, engineers, architects, and planners
3	1.0%	planners architects, and lawyers
3	1.0%	planners, architects, and enginners
3	1.0%	lawyers
2	.7%	lawyers and architects
1	.3%	engineers, architects, and lawyers
1	.3%	engineers and architects
58	19.8%	Yes (write in)
135	46.1%	No
17	5.8%	Other (specify)
		Not applicable

7. Did you use the Workbook *method with a participatory group (a decision-making body composed of a significant number of users, user group representatives, professionals, etc.)?*

35	11.9%	Yes, in an actual project
19	6.5%	Yes, in a test case, student project, etc.
53	18.1%	No, but as an in-house method used by one or two individuals
159	54.3%	No
13	4.4%	Other (specify)
		Not applicable

8. Have you used the Workbook *method, outline, or tools in any new way, that is, applied to different types of problems than those discussed in the* Workbook*?*

43	14.7%	Yes (explain briefly)
208	71.0%	No
4	1.4%	Other (specify)
		Not applicable

9. How many copies of the Workbook *did your group acquire?*

235	80.2%	1
36	12.3%	2 -- 10
2	.7%	10 -- 20
		25 or more
		Other (specify)
		Not applicable
		Do not know

10. How many projects (programs developed, research, student projects, etc.) have actually been executed with the aid of the Workbook *(method, catalogues, tools, instructions, etc.)?*

43	14.7%	1
53	18.1%	2 -- 5
4	1.4%	6 -- 15
5	1.7%	16 or more
131	44.7%	None
5	1.7%	Other (specify)
		Not applicable
		Do not know

11. How long have you had the Workbook *in your possession?*

26	8.9%	Less than 6 months
100	34.1%	6 months -- 1 year
161	54.9%	1 year -- 2 years

12. Which part(s) of the Workbook *did you find useful to you in your activities?*

92	31.4%	Part I, Planning and Design Aids
89	30.4%	Part II, Community Activity Planning
110	37.5%	Part III, Site Planning
77	26.3%	Part IV, Dwelling Unit Design
10	3.4%	Other (specify)
		Not applicable

13. Which of the followin

19	6.5%	Nonprofit housi ment corporatio
22	7.5%	Private develope development co
4	1.4%	Public housing d
9	3.1%	Federal agency
18	6.1%	Regional, state,
53	18.1%	City agency (pla Cities, Neighbor housing authori
16	5.5%	Citizens' group
25	8.5%	Concerned indiv
116	39.6%	Professional arc
59	20.1%	Professional pla
12	4.1%	Related professi
67	22.9%	University profe arm, administrat
2	.7%	University librar
7	2.4%	Library (other)
29	9.9%	Not applicable
		Other (specify)

14. In what geographic ar or provide services? (

194	66.2%	Dense urban (in
150	51.2%	Suburban (outer
71	24.2%	Rural areas
40	13.7%	Regions, natio
27	9.2%	Other (specify)
		Not applicable

ok method with a
ecision-making body
t number of users, user
rofessionals, etc.)?
oject
tudent project, etc.
ıse method used by one or

book *method, outline, or*
at is, applied to different
hose discussed in the

)

Workbook *did your*

10. How many projects (programs developed, research, student projects, etc.) have actually been executed with the aid of the Workbook *(method, catalogues, tools, instructions, etc.)?*

43	14.7%	1
53	18.1%	2 -- 5
4	1.4%	6 -- 15
5	1.7%	16 or more
131	44.7%	None
5	1.7%	Other (specify)
		Not applicable
		Do not know

11. How long have you had the Workbook *in your possession?*

26	8.9%	Less than 6 months
100	34.1%	6 months -- 1 year
161	54.9%	1 year -- 2 years

12. Which part(s) of the Workbook *did you find useful to you in your activities?*

92	31.4%	Part I, Planning and Design Aids
89	30.4%	Part II, Community Activity Planning
110	37.5%	Part III, Site Planning
77	26.3%	Part IV, Dwelling Unit Design
10	3.4%	Other (specify)
		Not applicable

13. Which of the following do you represent?

19	6.5%	Nonprofit housing sponsor (housing development corporation, community corporation)
22	7.5%	Private developer (for profit, housing development corporation, builder-corporation)
4	1.4%	Public housing development agency
9	3.1%	Federal agency
18	6.1%	Regional, state, or county agency
53	18.1%	City agency (planning department, Model Cities, Neighborhood Development Program, housing authority, mayor's office, etc.)
16	5.5%	Citizens' group
25	8.5%	Concerned individual
116	39.6%	Professional architect or urban designer
59	20.1%	Professional planner
12	4.1%	Related professional (specify)
67	22.9%	University professor, department, research arm, administrator
2	.7%	University library
7	2.4%	Library (other)
29	9.9%	Not applicable
		Other (specify)

14. In what geographic area(s) do you normally operate or provide services? (check all applicable)

194	66.2%	Dense urban (inner city core)
150	51.2%	Suburban (outer city belts)
71	24.2%	Rural areas
40	13.7%	Regions, nation(s)
27	9.2%	Other (specify)
		Not applicable

A.1.c

Pre-Survey Tally of Workbook Distribution, 20 March 1971

Recipients by Type	Ordered One or More Copies	Total Copies
Development Corporations: Housing; Community; Urban	36	37
Architects; Planners; Urban Design Professionals	253	278
Citizens Groups: Urban Coalition; Chamber of Commerce; Urban League, etc.	10	10
Advocacy Groups; CDC's; Community Action, etc.	12	14
Students	12	12
Universities; Professors; Research Arms	91	158
University Libraries	56	58
Federal Agencies	8	9
State, County, Regional Governmental Agencies	47	47
Local Governmental Agencies: City Planning Departments; Model Cities; Urban Renewal; Housing Authorities	118	125
Research Organizations	13	13
Libraries: Municipal; Public; Private	27	28
University and Commercial Retail Bookstores	50	108
Foundations	2	2
Lawyers	2	2

Recipients by Type	Ordered One or More Copies
Manufacturers/Industry	7
Secondary Schools	1
Planning Boards	6
Private Planning Assistance Associations	5
Public Utility Services	1
Engineers	2
U.S. Armed Forces	3
U.S. Peace Corps	3
Religious Organizations	6
Professional Societies, Associations, Organizations	8

The Workbook was not distributed solely in the United S
it came from individuals and organizations in the followi
Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, England, Finla
Germany, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Mexico, Norway, South
Switzerland, Venezuela, Vietnam, and West Indies.

A.1.c

Pre-Survey Tally of Workbook Distribution, 20 March 1971

	Ordered One or More Copies	Total Copies
s: an	36	37
n Design	253	278
alition; rban League, etc.	10	10
Community	12	14
	12	12
search Arms	91	158
	56	58
	8	9
overnmental	47	47
cies: City del Cities; Authorities	118	125
	13	13
c; Private	27	28
l Retail	50	108
	2	2
	2	2
	25	

Recipients by Type	Ordered One or More Copies	Total Copies
Manufacturers/Industry	7	7
Secondary Schools	1	1
Planning Boards	6	7
Private Planning Assistance Associations	5	5
Public Utility Services	1	1
Engineers	2	2
U.S. Armed Forces	3	3
U.S. Peace Corps	3	3
Religious Organizations	6	6
Professional Societies, Associations, Organizations	8	31

The Workbook was not distributed solely in the United States; orders for it came from individuals and organizations in the following countries: Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, England, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Mexico, Norway, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Venezuela, Vietnam, and West Indies.

A.2

Supporting Information Submitted by Alan Mallach

The following is provided as a footnote of sorts to the evaluation study of the Workbook, specifically to questions of the initial sponsorship by the State of New Jersey, and of technical assistance by states, along the lines called for in the Workbook, to community organizations.

Although not yet created when the first decision was made by the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs to support preparation of the Workbook,* the Community Development Program had become the Department's liaison from late 1968, and in the summer of 1969 was entrusted with the Department's share of Workbooks, 100 copies. By this time the casual improvisatory spirit which existed in the Department during its first year or so (to mid-1968) had been replaced, in the absence of tangible signs of success, by a measure of consolidation and a reluctance to rock the boat. It is fair to say that the Community Development Program represented the only part of the Department concerned with physical development in any way which maintained a serious interest in active work with community groups in the physical planning process (as distinct from responsiveness, which the Department did occasionally show). Furthermore, in early 1969 the CDP program had been a major antagonist of much of the rest of the agency in a major controversy over precisely this issue; although it won the specific case, the fight may well have hardened opposition to its activities in the future.

At the time the Workbook was completed, the Community Development Program had only two staff members (the two senior staff), both with many other responsibilities, who had the expertise to provide services thro
out major training. As a result, the fi
other, larger parts of the Department
to act as providers of technical assist
State Model Cities Technical Assistan
copies of the Workbook, explanatory
sonal visits were provided, neither th
nor the New Jersey Housing Finance
serious interest in the Workbook or t
the CDP program decided to use its o
senior member of the Workbook tean
faculty as a consultant to provide ser
groups interested in housing develop
in the fall of 1969. After a few mont
potentials became apparent, but the e
sources and general lack of support fr
formal development powers made dif
administration entered the New Jerse
point, or shortly after, not through t
by the new administration but throug
holdovers to attempt to anticipate th
leadership, the CDP program was inst
local activities and those involving di
ities, and from then on to concentrat
and research questions. The Number
left almost immediately, followed wi
the program director. Needless to say
made of the Workbook.

Although sad, this history, in retrosp
prising. It is, perhaps, surprising that

*As far as one can determine at this point, this arose out of a sort of vague intellectual curiosity rather than any real belief that the Workbook could or should ever be used.

Supporting Information Submitted by Alan Mallach

The following is provided as a footnote of sorts to the evaluation study of the Workbook, specifically to questions of the initial sponsorship by the State of New Jersey, and of technical assistance by states, along the lines called for in the Workbook, to community organizations.

Although not yet created when the first decision was made by the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs to support preparation of the Workbook,* the Community Development Program had become the Department's liaison from late 1968, and in the summer of 1969 was entrusted with the Department's share of Workbooks, 100 copies. By this time the casual improvisatory spirit which existed in the Department during its first year or so (to mid-1968) had been replaced, in the absence of tangible signs of success, by a measure of consolidation and a reluctance to rock the boat. It is fair to say that the Community Development Program represented the only part of the Department concerned with physical development in any way which maintained a serious interest in active work with community groups in the physical planning process (as distinct from responsiveness, which the Department did occasionally show). Furthermore, in early 1969 the CDP program had been a major antagonist of much of the rest of the agency in a major controversy over precisely this issue; although it won the specific case, the fight may well have hardened opposition to its activities in the future.

At the time the Workbook was completed, the Community Development Program had only two staff members (the two senior staff), both with many other responsibilities, who had the expertise to provide services through the Workbook without major training. As a result, the first effort was to interest other, larger parts of the Department of Community Affairs to act as providers of technical assistance, particularly the State Model Cities Technical Assistance Program. Although copies of the Workbook, explanatory memoranda, and personal visits were provided, neither the Model Cities Agency nor the New Jersey Housing Finance Agency showed any serious interest in the Workbook or the process. At this point the CDP program decided to use its own funds to hire a senior member of the Workbook team on the Princeton faculty as a consultant to provide services to community groups interested in housing development. This work began in the fall of 1969. After a few months, during which some potentials became apparent, but the extremely limited resources and general lack of support from those agencies with formal development powers made difficult to pursue, a new administration entered the New Jersey State House. At that point, or shortly after, not through the explicit statements by the new administration but through the efforts of prior holdovers to attempt to anticipate the policies of the new leadership, the CDP program was instructed to phase out of local activities and those involving direct service to communities, and from then on to concentrate on statewide planning and research questions. The Number 2 man in the program left almost immediately, followed within a few months by the program director. Needless to say, no subsequent use was made of the Workbook.

Although sad, this history, in retrospect, is relatively unsurprising. It is, perhaps, surprising that the notion of the state

point,
ellectual
f that
r be used.

providing the technical support for the use of the Workbook was taken as seriously as it was. Although New Jersey was probably providing more general technical assistance to localities than all but a handful of states, its services were limited by the small number of staff available, and the large number of eligible communities. As a result there was considerable pressure to provide services only in areas which appeared to promise relatively large payoffs for small investments of time. Furthermore, given political realities and the evanescence of most community groups, as a rule it is far simpler to provide services directly to municipal governments on an essentially bureaucratic basis. All of these militate against effective use of the Workbook, since its clientele is primarily the community body directly affected, and its benefits primarily qualitative rather than quantitative. After all, in the final analysis, most officials at any level of government feel that a house is a house, and a project is a project, and when you've seen one you've seen them all. Under these circumstances, elaborate consultative and planning processes could only be seen as a waste of time.

A.3

Specific Information Requested

This appendix lists (a) new general, and somewhat universal, issues and policies identified by respondents that require clarification and expansion, and (b) additional planning and design standards information (translation) that Workbook owners found lacking in the publication. This material is presented in sketch form as a reference for future work.

A.3.a

New 'Sample Issues and Policies' to be Investigated

The following represent general issues which were not included in the 'sample issues' sections of Part I, II, and III of the Workbook but which seem common problems in many communities.

1. **Zoning**

What to do about zoning constraints, boards of appeal, restrictive zoning, and new legislation. This subject can be investigated, particularly since legislation concerning local zoning is now entering into flux in many states.

2. **New Technologies and Systems Building**

Any issue concerning the physical design or planning can be investigated using Workbook methods. New investigative and alternative technologies were not cited unless seen as a real possibility. As new systems become available they should be absorbed into the format and catalogue of a
and referenced generally in the issues-policies, s
and bibliography sections. See 3.4, Planning an
Innovation; Development and Implementation.

3. **Administration Implementation/Developmen**

A number of comments alluded to problems of
tion, development, and implementation. Althou
these tacit problems embedded in the planning
process were not discussed at length, the Introd
that the total process would not be carried out
that professionals and special consultants famili
ever-changing legislation, construction industry,
services and such, would inject much of the info
the process sooner or later, sooner seen as benef
possible. Information, issues, and guidelines for
including, and contracting of knowledgeable de
and/or contractors could be expanded upon in t

4. **Auto Transportation**

Further issues identified dealt with parking, urb
rights-of-way, and air rights over rights-of-way.
be expanded upon in Part II, Community Activi

5. **Historical Preservation**

Issues and policies related to monuments and/o
areas with symbolic value or meaning, especiall
to the question of housing economies.

This appendix lists (a) new general, and somewhat universal, issues and policies identified by respondents that require clarification and expansion, and (b) additional planning and design standards information (translation) that Workbook owners found lacking in the publication. This material is presented in sketch form as a reference for future work.

A.3.a

New 'Sample Issues and Policies' to be Investigated

The following represent general issues which were not included in the 'sample issues' sections of Part I, II, and III of the Workbook but which seem common problems in many communities.

1. **Zoning**

What to do about zoning constraints, boards of appeal, restrictive zoning, and new legislation. This subject can be investigated, particularly since legislation concerning local zoning is now entering into flux in many states.

2. **New Technologies and Systems Building**

Any issue concerning the physical design or planning can be investigated using Workbook methods. New investigative and alternative technologies were not cited unless seen as a real possibility. As new systems become available they should be absorbed into the format and catalogue of available types and referenced generally in the issues-policies, standards, and bibliography sections. See 3.4, Planning and Design Innovation; Development and Implementation.

3. **Administration Implementation/Development**

A number of comments alluded to problems of administration, development, and implementation. Although some of these tacit problems embedded in the planning and design process were not discussed at length, the Introduction stated that the total process would not be carried out in a vacuum, that professionals and special consultants familiar with the ever-changing legislation, construction industry, contracting services and such, would inject much of the information into the process sooner or later, sooner seen as beneficial if at all possible. Information, issues, and guidelines for identifying, including, and contracting of knowledgeable developers and/or contractors could be expanded upon in the future.

4. **Auto Transportation**

Further issues identified dealt with parking, urban freeways, rights-of-way, and air rights over rights-of-way. These might be expanded upon in Part II, Community Activity Planning.

5. **Historical Preservation**

Issues and policies related to monuments and/or older urban areas with symbolic value or meaning, especially as related to the question of housing economies.

6. **Cost Data**

Although dealt with in Part I of the Workbook this could be augmented, however, it might encumber the report unnecessarily. Such information should be under the province of a technical expert.

7. **Contextual Variety**

Additional sets of 'sample issues and policies' should be developed to relate to smaller urban centers: 50,000 to 100,000 population; urban fringe areas; suburban areas; rural areas. Some of these might represent new 'Parts' of the Workbook with their own catalogues of physical types, standards, and references.

8. **Funding Programs**

Requests were made for information on current funding programs on the national, state, and local levels. Initially, these were excluded owing to (1) their transitory nature, and (2) the existence of innumerable program summaries in handbook form published by the Federal government, the Urban Coalition, regional and local groups, and in numerous journals. These summary sources should be referenced and updated periodically.

9. **'Red Tape' and Bureaucracy**

As an issue, this is dealt with in the Workbook, but perhaps unsatisfactorily. It is discussed as part of our socio-political process and can only change in response to broad change or high-energy local action. No workbook can reduce red tape. If a group desires to deal with it, policies may be generated and action taken.

10. **Environment/Ecology**

Issues relating to vegetation, water, soils, light and air pollution. Detail in these areas may be prohibitive, but these concerns might also be referenced.

11. **Construction Materials**

Although the choice of materials should be made with a professional architect/engineer, various factors such as cost and weathering might be referenced. This is another level of detail which could defeat the purpose of the Workbook.

A.3.b

Additional Planning and Design Standards to be Researched

1. **Recreation and Leisure Time Facilities**

Playgrounds, furniture, etc. (especially for Part II, Community Activity Planning).

2. **Furnishings, Standards for and Sizes of** (kitchen equipment, new furniture types, etc.)

3. **Equipment Standards and Sizes**

More detail by type, production, relative cost.

4. **Neighborhood/Community Activity Planning Standards**

Few legislated standards exist, however, a number of publications deal in depth with normally accepted practice and could be included or referenced (see A.6).

A.4

Projects, by Type, Aided by Workbook Method or Materials

Question 15: Please list below any projects worked on in which the Workbook played a role. Include projects related to teaching, research, etc.

The following list of projects was submitted in response to Question 15.

Educational Planning and Research Projects
Community Activity Planning (Urban)
Community Activity Planning (Suburban)
New Communities
Urban Housing Schemes
Suburban Housing Schemes
Fringe Developments
Federal Projects
Intern Programs
Educational Facilities Planning
Research Projects
Educational Tool
Guidelines and Policy
Miscellaneous

Educational Planning and Research Projects

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
2 A pilot model program for an eco-sensitive northern community.	C. R. Nelson, Jr., Head Department of Environmental Studies University of Manitoba Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada
3 Research on small town self-help rehabilitation.	D. Procos, Assistant Professor School of Architecture Nova Scotia Technical College Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada
41 Multidisciplinary student projects: Miami River Development; 63rd Street Development, Miami.	H. S. Krusé, Architect, Planner, Teacher Watson, Deutschman & Krusé Miami, Florida
55 Individual study of housing.	J. W. Fine, Student University of Illinois Urbana, Illinois
91 Community facilities planning project.	T. Laging, Assistant Professor of Architecture University of Nebraska Lincoln, Nebraska
96 Senior design course: low- to moderate-income housing.	H. Licklider, Professor of Architecture and Urban Planning Princeton University Princeton, New Jersey
107 Thesis project.	M. Herman Hollis, New York
116 Staten Island Medical Group proposed subcenter: student project.	C. B. Zucker, Research Architect School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York
117 Approximately 60 student thesis projects.	B. P. Spring, Dean School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York
120 Thesis project: Relocatable school facilities.	E. Nivin, S School of A Environme The City C of New Yo New York,
167 Community planning projects in two older sections of Seattle.	D. Miller, L University Seattle, Wa
177 Course work and related project work at Community Projects Laboratory, M.I.T.	H. Harms, Architectu Massachuse Cambridge,
184 Research for term paper for class in citizen participation.	Mrs. J. Orn Malibu, Cal
192 Projects involving design-related research in limited-income housing and home furnishings.	W. J. Mora Departmen Southern I Carbondale
210 Thesis project: Pre-K-2 school, day-care center, library and teen-age center, included in one building.	B. Barachov Beyer, Blin New York,
221 Housing-oriented design projects.	G. A. Trosk University Clark, Alta Urbana, Ill
229 Student projects in housing and site development.	H. A. Elart Virginia Po State Unive Blacksburg,
232 Student project: 'Mid-Town, West Side,' New York.	J. D. Kaufm former Inst Voorhees T University Forest Hills

Research Projects

project	Respondent
am for an eco-nity.	C. R. Nelson, Jr., Head Department of Environmental Studies University of Manitoba Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada
wn self-help	D. Procos, Assistant Professor School of Architecture Nova Scotia Technical College Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada
dent projects: 63rd Street	H. S. Krusé, Architect, Planner, Teacher Watson, Deutschman & Krusé Miami, Florida
ousing.	J. W. Fine, Student University of Illinois Urbana, Illinois
planning	T. Laging, Assistant Professor of Architecture University of Nebraska Lincoln, Nebraska
low- to	H. Licklider, Professor of Architecture and Urban Planning Princeton University Princeton, New Jersey
	M. Herman Hollis, New York
Group pro-oject.	C. B. Zucker, Research Architect School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York
dent thesis	B. P. Spring, Dean School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
120 Thesis project: Relocatable school facilities.	E. Nivin, Student School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York
167 Community planning projects in two older sections of Seattle.	D. Miller, Lecturer University of Washington Seattle, Washington
177 Course work and related project work at Community Projects Laboratory, M.I.T.	H. Harms, Assistant Professor of Architecture Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, Massachusetts
184 Research for term paper for class in citizen participation.	Mrs. J. Orne Malibu, California
192 Projects involving design-related research in limited-income housing and home furnishings.	W. J. Moran, Chairman Department of Interior Design Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Illinois
210 Thesis project: Pre-K-2 school, day-care center, library and teen-age center, included in one building.	B. Barachowitz, Architect Beyer, Blinder and Belle New York, New York
221 Housing-oriented design projects.	G. A. Trosky, Student and Draftsman University of Illinois, and Clark, Altay & Associates Urbana, Illinois
229 Student projects in housing and site development.	H. A. Elarth, Professor of Architecture Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Blacksburg, Virginia
232 Student project: 'Mid-Town, West Side,' New York.	J. D. Kaufman, Architect and former Instructor Voorhees Technical College of The City University of New York Forest Hills, New York

Educational Planning and Research Projects (continued)

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
253 Community education: 'The Dwelling Unit' (types, etc.). Troy Neighborhood Infill: Student project in advocacy planning for a small community.	C. A. Gossett, Student Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Troy, New York
254 Student project: Housing for site in Boston.	S. Rubin, Lecturer, Architect Boston Architectural Center and Arcop Associates Montreal, Quebec, Canada
280 Various housing schemes. Low- and/or medium-income housing for Fort Lauderdale, Florida; Savannah, Georgia; and Miami, Florida. Student housing for the University of Florida.	M. Chosyczer, Student Department of Architecture University of Florida Gainesville, Florida
289 Various student projects (used as reference material).	R. S. Nordhaus, Asst. Professor and Asst. Director of Design and Planning, Assistance Center University of New Mexico Albuquerque, New Mexico
291 Urban renewal project for 87th and Mackinaw district of Chicago. Student project.	J. A. Martinez, Student Department of Architecture University of Illinois Urbana, Illinois
293 'Solving communication problems between Model Cities groups and architects-urban designers.' 'New towns' study (used as resource material). Student project.	D. F. Jaquith, Student (now Architect) Beverly, Massachusetts

Community Activity Planning (Urban)

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
14 Watts Parcel 'J' redevelopment, Los Angeles.	W. A. Craig, Los Angeles,
15 Long Beach General Renewal Plan, Long Beach, California.	D. S. Scheele Social Engine Los Angeles,
16 Community redevelopment, Los Angeles.	J. A. Deutsch Community Los Angeles,
29 Various projects related to the planning and Model Cities programs for a model neighborhood, Hartford.	E. P. Spitzne Model Cities Hartford, Co
50 Planned Urban Development proposal, Wood Dale, Illinois.	H. Patterson, Patterson & Chicago, Illin
53 Establishment and early operation of a citizen action committee, Oak Park.	D. Chapman, and Develop Oak Park, Ill
59 Land use model as educational tool for the community.	W. L. Coco, City-Parish B Baton Rouge
71 Urban renewal, Eugene, Oregon.	Fred Stark, D Henneberg & Cambridge, M
79 Environmental characteristics planning for the Regional Council, Baltimore.	P. C. Christie The Architec Towson, Mar
87 Westport area plan, Kansas City, Missouri.	K. Zeff, City Kansas City,
91 Community facilities planning project, University of Nebraska with the Lincoln community.	T. Laging, As Architecture University of Lincoln, Neb

esearch Projects (continued)

project	Respondent
: 'The Student g for a	C. A. Gossett, Student Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Troy, New York
sing for site	S. Rubin, Lecturer, Architect Boston Architectural Center and Arcop Associates Montreal, Quebec, Canada
nes. Low- sing for Fort ah, Georgia; versity of	M. Chosyczer, Student Department of Architecture University of Florida Gainesville, Florida
cts (used as	R. S. Nordhaus, Asst. Professor and Asst. Director of Design and Planning, Assistance Center University of New Mexico Albuquerque, New Mexico
for 87th and o.	J. A. Martinez, Student Department of Architecture University of Illinois Urbana, Illinois
on problems s and	D. F. Jaquith, Student (now Architect) Beverly, Massachusetts
resource	

Community Activity Planning (Urban)

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
14 Watts Parcel 'J' redevelopment, Los Angeles.	W. A. Craig, Architect Los Angeles, California
15 Long Beach General Renewal Plan, Long Beach, California.	D. S. Scheele, Partner Social Engineering Technology Los Angeles, California
16 Community redevelopment, Los Angeles.	J. A. Deutsch, City Planner Community Redevelopment Agency Los Angeles, California
29 Various projects related to the planning and Model Cities programs for a model neighborhood, Hartford.	E. P. Spitzner, Chief of Evaluation Model Cities Agency Hartford, Connecticut
50 Planned Urban Development proposal, Wood Dale, Illinois.	H. Patterson, President Patterson & Probst, Inc. Chicago, Illinois
53 Establishment and early operation of a citizen action committee, Oak Park.	D. Chapman, Director of Planning and Development Oak Park, Illinois
59 Land use model as educational tool for the community.	W. L. Coco, Director City-Parish Beautification Committee Baton Rouge, Louisiana
71 Urban renewal, Eugene, Oregon.	Fred Stark, Designer Henneberg & Henneberg Cambridge, Massachusetts
79 Environmental characteristics planning for the Regional Council, Baltimore.	P. C. Christie, Architect and Partner The Architectural Affiliation Towson, Maryland
87 Westport area plan, Kansas City, Missouri.	K. Zeff, City Planner Kansas City, Missouri
91 Community facilities planning project, University of Nebraska with the Lincoln community.	T. Laging, Assistant Professor of Architecture University of Nebraska Lincoln, Nebraska

Community Activity Planning (Urban) (continued)

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
94 Fairmont urban renewal project. Preliminary development program, Newark.	W. Yuen, Executive Director Newark Housing Council Newark, New Jersey
117 Programming for three parks.	B. P. Spring, Dean School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York
131 Development of general plan for Model Cities area, Akron, Ohio, by Kent State University; student project.	F. D. Armstrong, Associate Professor of Architecture Kent State University Kent, Ohio
138 P.A.C.T. Community Congress, Southeast Portland.	S. Sharpe, Associate Director Urban Studies Center Portland State University Portland, Oregon
141 Research dealing with outdoor recreation for Allentown.	D. Petro, Planning Researcher Allentown City Planning Commission Allentown, Pennsylvania
142 Urban renewal project planning, Johnstown.	M. P. Flynn, Executive Director Johnstown Redevelopment Authority Johnstown, Pennsylvania
145 Recreational planning.	D. Feldsher, Architect Department of Recreation Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
147 Numerous neighborhood development programs; development controls, Philadelphia.	P. Franks, Architect formerly Model Cities Planner Philadelphia City Planning Commission Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
150 San Juan Model Cities programs.	D. Shelley, President Shelley Enterprises San Juan, Puerto Rico
154 Report on open space.	D. B. Stanley Citizens Con El Paso, Tex
171 Development of neighborhood design plan, Sheboygan.	F. J. Paquett Department Sheboygan,
173 Land use plan goals, South Norwalk.	K. O'Mara, A Planning and South Norwa
174 Newark Model Cities Program. Newark Housing Development and Rehabilitation Corporation.	R. Sangine, A Skidmore, O Washington,
175 Avondale urban design studies, Cincinnati, Ohio.	E. Jakmauh, Planner Rogers, Talia Baltimore, M
179 Housing for inner-city ghetto, Miami, Florida.	J. C. Beal, H Research Tri Commission Research Tri
195 Housing for the Resident Development Corporation, Chicago. Housing for the Racine/Polk Community Development Corporation. Housing for the 'Valley' Association Program. Housing for the B'Nai Zaken Organization Development. Drug Abuse Center, Day-Care Center and Learning Opportunities Center for the West Side Organization, Chicago.	D. Hanson, P and Architec Center for U University of Chicago, Illi
200 Preparation of Neighborhood Development Plan application and sketch plan.	D. Houston, for the City Rock Island,

ng (Urban) (continued)

project	Respondent
al project.	W. Yuen, Executive Director Newark Housing Council Newark, New Jersey
parks.	B. P. Spring, Dean School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York
al plan for hio, by Kent oject.	F. D. Armstrong, Associate Professor of Architecture Kent State University Kent, Ohio
Congress,	S. Sharpe, Associate Director Urban Studies Center Portland State University Portland, Oregon
outdoor recrea-	D. Petro, Planning Researcher Allentown City Planning Commission Allentown, Pennsylvania
planning,	M. P. Flynn, Executive Director Johnstown Redevelopment Authority Johnstown, Pennsylvania
	D. Feldsher, Architect Department of Recreation Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
od develop- t controls,	P. Franks, Architect formerly Model Cities Planner Philadelphia City Planning Commission Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
programs.	D. Shelley, President Shelley Enterprises San Juan, Puerto Rico

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
154 Report on open space.	D. B. Stanley, Architect Citizens Committee on Open Space El Paso, Texas
171 Development of neighborhood design plan, Sheboygan.	F. J. Paquette, Director Department of City Development Sheboygan, Wisconsin
173 Land use plan goals, South Norwalk.	K. O'Mara, Asst. Planner Planning and Zoning Commission South Norwalk, Connecticut
174 Newark Model Cities Program. Newark Housing Development and Rehabilitation Corporation.	R. Sangine, Architect Skidmore, Owings & Merrill Washington, D.C.
175 Avondale urban design studies, Cincinnati, Ohio.	E. Jakmauh, Architect/Urban Designer/Planner Rogers, Taliaferro, Kostritsky and Lamb Baltimore, Maryland
179 Housing for inner-city ghetto, Miami, Florida.	J. C. Beal, Housing Assistant Research Triangle Regional Planning Commission Research Triangle Park, North Carolina
195 Housing for the Resident Development Corporation, Chicago. Housing for the Racine/Polk Community Development Corporation. Housing for the 'Valley' Association Program. Housing for the B'Nai Zaken Organization Development. Drug Abuse Center, Day-Care Center and Learning Opportunities Center for the West Side Organization, Chicago.	D. Hanson, Professor of Urban Sciences and Architecture Center for Urban Studies University of Illinois Chicago, Illinois
200 Preparation of Neighborhood Development Plan application and sketch plan.	D. Houston, Redevelopment Administrator for the City of Rock Island Rock Island, Illinois

Community Activity Planning (Urban) (continued)

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
209 Easton-Taylor land use survey.	M. L. Corn, formerly Neighborhood Developer Easton-Taylor Gateway Center of the Human Development Corporation St. Louis, Missouri
217 Normandie Neighborhood Development Plan, Los Angeles.	R. P. Shaffer, Planner Gruen Associates Los Angeles, California
276 East End Area Council, Cincinnati, Ohio (used to educate citizen members of the Council and as a guide in the planning process).	J. A. Supik, Graduate Student Department of Community Planning University of Cincinnati Cincinnati, Ohio
296 City core redevelopment. Assisting the South Vietnamese government with solutions to urban problems.	F. P. Swiss, Urban Planner CORDS/UP APO, San Francisco, California
298 Urban community development and self-help housing construction, Santiago.	D. R. Schramm, Associate Director Peace Corps Santiago, Chile

Community Activity Planning (Suburban)

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
1 Suburban townhouses (approximately 1600 units) and related facilities.	P. Wregleswor Smith, Carter Winnipeg, Ma
30 Planning and zoning for the town of New Canaan.	J. B. Lee, Arc New Canaan P Commission New Canaan,
117 Proposal for design of a new neighborhood near Moscow, U.S.S.R., with Davis, Brody and Associates, New York City.	B. P. Spring, School of Ar Environmenta The City Col of New York New York, N
195 Comprehensive planning study for the Village of Downers Grove, Illinois.	D: Hanson, Pr and Architect University of Chicago, Illinc
213 Various projects in Texas under '701' program: University City, Devine, and Schertz, Texas.	C. C. Flores, P Architect Marmon & Mo San Antonio,
243 Comprehensive sector plan for a 20-square mile area with a present population of 60,000.	K. M. Husain, City Planning Fort Worth, T
255 Physical environment task force, Tacoma, Washington.	N. C. Porter, J Levitt United Colorado Spri
291 Martin-Jefferson urban renewal project, Flint, Michigan: actual project.	J. A. Martinez Department o University of Urbana, Illino

(Urban) (continued)

ject	Respondent
urvey.	M. L. Corn, formerly Neighborhood Developer Easton-Taylor Gateway Center of the Human Development Corporation St. Louis, Missouri
d s.	R. P. Shaffer, Planner Gruen Associates Los Angeles, California
ate l and ess).	J. A. Supik, Graduate Student Department of Community Planning University of Cincinnati Cincinnati, Ohio
e govern- roblems.	F. P. Swiss, Urban Planner CORDS/UP APO, San Francisco, California
opment tion,	D. R. Schramm, Associate Director Peace Corps Santiago, Chile

Community Activity Planning (Suburban)

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
1 Suburban townhouses (approximately 1600 units) and related facilities.	P. Wreglesworth, Design Architect Smith, Carter & Parkin Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada
30 Planning and zoning for the town of New Canaan.	J. B. Lee, Architect New Canaan Planning and Zoning Commission New Canaan, Connecticut
117 Proposal for design of a new neighborhood near Moscow, U.S.S.R., with Davis, Brody and Associates, New York City.	B. P. Spring, Dean School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York
195 Comprehensive planning study for the Village of Downers Grove, Illinois.	D: Hanson, Professor of Urban Science and Architecture University of Illinois Chicago, Illinois
213 Various projects in Texas under '701' program: University City, Devine, and Schertz, Texas.	C. C. Flores, Project Planner and Architect Marmon & Mok & Green & Associates San Antonio, Texas
243 Comprehensive sector plan for a 20-square mile area with a present population of 60,000.	K. M. Husain, Senior Planner City Planning Department Fort Worth, Texas
255 Physical environment task force, Tacoma, Washington.	N. C. Porter, Jr., Project Director Levitt United Multihousing Colorado Springs, Colorado
291 Martin-Jefferson urban renewal project, Flint, Michigan: actual project.	J. A. Martinez, Student Department of Architecture University of Illinois Urbana, Illinois

New Communities

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
175 Fort Lincoln New Town, Washington, D.C.	E. Jakmauh, Architect/Urban Designer/ Planner Rogers, Taliaferro, Kostritsky and Lamb Baltimore, Maryland
263 New Town development-- convergence of concept and reality.	S. F. Weiss, Associate Research Director Center for Urban and Regional Studies University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, North Carolina
296 New Town design.	F. P. Swiss, Urban Planner CORDS/UP APO, San Francisco, California

Urban Housing Schemes

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
31 Housing projects, New Haven.	C. A. Ahlstro Ahlstrom & L New Haven, C
70 M.I.T.-related housing projects, Cambridge.	P. H. Bandma M.I.T. Planni Cambridge, M
81 Old West Side Garden Homes subdivision, Ann Arbor.	C. Roy, Presi Old West Side Ann Arbor, M
148 Site planning and dwelling unit design for low-income housing projects proposed by local Urban Redevelopment Authority.	J. T. Radelet, Celli-Flynn & Pittsburgh, Pe
153 Infill housing, low-income housing, Beaumont. Plymouth Village, 150 units, Beaumont.	J. L. Harden, Associated Ar Beaumont, Te
273 Housing planning: Newark, Perth Amboy, and Bridgeton, New Jersey.	A. Mallach, fo Community D Program Division of St Planning New Jersey D Affairs; presently, Ass Livingston Co New Brunswi
274 Neighborhood Development Corporation, Columbus.	E. L. Crawley Model Cities C Agency Columbus, Oh
278 High-density housing project for a developer (never built).	C. H. Clark, A Toronto, Ont

oject	Respondent
),	E. Jakmauh, Architect/Urban Designer/ Planner Rogers, Taliaferro, Kostritsky and Lamb Baltimore, Maryland
t-- eality.	S. F. Weiss, Associate Research Director Center for Urban and Regional Studies University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, North Carolina
	F. P. Swiss, Urban Planner CORDS/UP APO, San Francisco, California

Urban Housing Schemes

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
31 Housing projects, New Haven.	C. A. Ahlstrom, Principal Ahlstrom & Lee, Architects New Haven, Connecticut
70 M.I.T.-related housing projects, Cambridge.	P. H. Bandmann, Senior Planner M.I.T. Planning Office Cambridge, Massachusetts
81 Old West Side Garden Homes subdivision, Ann Arbor.	C. Roy, President Old West Side Association Ann Arbor, Michigan
148 Site planning and dwelling unit design for low-income housing projects proposed by local Urban Redevelopment Authority.	J. T. Radelet, Architect Celli-Flynn & Associates Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
153 Infill housing, low-income housing, Beaumont. Plymouth Village, 150 units, Beaumont.	J. L. Harden, Architect Associated Architects Beaumont, Texas
273 Housing planning: Newark, Perth Amboy, and Bridgeton, New Jersey.	A. Mallach, formerly Chief Community Development Planning Program Division of State and Regional Planning New Jersey Department of Community Affairs; presently, Assistant Dean Livingston College New Brunswick, New Jersey
274 Neighborhood Development Corporation, Columbus.	E. L. Crawley, Public Relations Model Cities City Demonstration Agency Columbus, Ohio
278 High-density housing project for a developer (never built).	C. H. Clark, Architect Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Suburban Housing Schemes

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
11 Venice Community Improvement Union Housing Study, Los Angeles.	A. W. Lerch, President The Urban Concern Los Angeles, California
31 Housing projects in New Haven and suburbs.	C. A. Ahlstrom, Principal Ahlstrom & Lee, Architects New Haven, Connecticut

Federal Projects

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
38 Operation Breakthrough.	C. E. Thomse Design Policy U.S. Departm Urban Develo Washington, D
174 Operation Breakthrough site planning.	R. Sangine, A Skidmore, Ow Washington, D

Fringe Developments

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
84 Northwest Property Owners Association general development plans, Rochester.	R. C. Krier, Long-Range Planner City of Rochester Rochester, Minnesota

Intern Programs

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
42 Summer intern program planning project, Dade County, Florida.	J. C. Beckett, Metropolitan U.S. Departm Urban Develo Miami, Florid

roject	Respondent
provement ngeles.	A. W. Lerch, President The Urban Concern Los Angeles, California
w Haven and	C. A. Ahlstrom, Principal Ahlstrom & Lee, Architects New Haven, Connecticut

Federal Projects

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
38 Operation Breakthrough.	C. E. Thomsen, Special Assistant for Design Policy U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Washington, D.C.
174 Operation Breakthrough site planning.	R. Sangine, Architect Skidmore, Owings & Merrill Washington, D.C.

Intern Programs

roject	Respondent
ners ent	R. C. Krier, Long-Range Planner City of Rochester Rochester, Minnesota

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
42 Summer intern program planning project, Dade County, Florida.	J. C. Beckett, Administrative Officer Metropolitan Dade County U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Miami, Florida

Educational Facilities Planning

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
116 Educational facilities planning, Hempstead, Long Island, New York, School District No. 12.	C. B. Zucker, Research Architect School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York
117 Programming for Malverne schools, Malverne, New York. Evaluation method for New York State University construction fund.	B. P. Spring, Dean School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York

Research Projects

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
5 Project for Royal Institute of Technology and the National Council of Building Research: Revitalization of towns in the mining belt, middle-Sweden.	J. Allpere, Pr School of Ar Royal Institu Stockholm,
17 Criteria for planning the residential environment.	G. Schalman, Criteria for th Los Angeles,
38 Research and demonstration project, New York, New York.	C. E. Thomse for Design Pc U.S. Departm Urban Develc Washington,
102 Personal research and study.	J. G. Cruzan, New Jersey D and Regional Trenton, Nev
143 General housing research.	P. H. Brown, Architecture Young Great Philadelphia,
162 Linear programming and site design analysis.	S. S. Skjei, School of A Planning, Pri presently, As Department University o Charlottesvil
195 Development of systems of existing structural products for more extensive application to market potential of low- and moderate-income housing, Inland-Ryerson Steel Company.	D. Hanson, P and Architec Center for U University of Chicago, Illin
246 Television film (videotape) on urban renewal.	R. Daru, Res Environment Bouwcentrur Rotterdam,

oject	Respondent
planning, v York,	C. B. Zucker, Research Architect School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York
ne schools, ork State	B. P. Spring, Dean School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York

Research Projects

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
5 Project for Royal Institute of Technology and the National Council of Building Research: Revitalization of towns in the mining belt, middle-Sweden.	J. Allpere, Professor School of Architecture Royal Institute of Technology Stockholm, Sweden
17 Criteria for planning the residential environment.	G. Schalman, Research Associate Criteria for the Residental Environment Los Angeles, California
38 Research and demonstration project, New York, New York.	C. E. Thomsen, Special Assistant for Design Policy U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Washington, D.C.
102 Personal research and study.	J. G. Cruzan, Principal Planner New Jersey Division of State and Regional Planning Trenton, New Jersey
143 General housing research.	P. H. Brown, Director Architecture and Planning Young Great Society Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
162 Linear programming and site design analysis.	S. S. Skjei, formerly Assistant Professor School of Architecture and Urban Planning, Princeton University; presently, Assistant Professor Department of Environmental Sciences University of Virginia Charlottesville, Virginia
195 Development of systems of existing structural products for more extensive application to market potential of low- and moderate-income housing, Inland-Ryerson Steel Company.	D. Hanson, Professor of Urban Science and Architecture Center for Urban Studies University of Illinois Chicago, Illinois
246 Television film (videotape) on urban renewal.	R. Daru, Research Architect Environmental Workshop Bouwcentrum Rotterdam, Netherlands

Educational Tool

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
156 Resident and staff training, San Antonio.	C. C. McRanen, Evaluation Manager Department of Model Cities San Antonio, Texas
248 Used in teaching seminars in community planning and citizen participation.	C. Lieder, Assistant Professor School of Social Work and Community Planning University of Maryland Baltimore, Maryland
296 Training tool, staff of Directorate General, Reconstruction and Urban Planning.	F. P. Swiss, Urban Planner CORDS/UP APO, San Francisco, California

Guidelines and Policy

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
50 Illinois Housing Development Authority guides and procedures manual.	H. Patterson, President Patterson & Probst, Inc. Chicago, Illinois
118 Development of handbook for the evaluation of public facility programs.	C. Bee, Instructor, Research Associate School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York

Miscellaneous

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
41 Planning and zoning: center commercial district rezoning, city of Plantation. Urban renewal: demountable office project for little HUD.	H. S. Krusé, A Watson, Deuts Miami, Florida
43 **Princeton University Land Planning and Housing Potentials: A Preliminary Assessment,** Lance Jay Brown, Project Director, Princeton University School of Architecture and Urban Planning, October 1970: Research into industrial development (strip-type) catalogue types; Expansion of housing site planning catalogue.	S. G. Saunders Student and R Princeton Univ Architecture a presently, Arc Milton C. Harr 4100 North M Miami, Florida
117 Planning for Massachusetts General Hospital with Davis, Brody & Associates, New York City.	B. P. Spring, D School of Arch Environmental The City Colle University of N New York, Ne
162 **Princeton University Land Planning and Housing Potentials: A Preliminary Assessment,** Lance Jay Brown, Project Director, Princeton University School of Architecture and Urban Planning, October 1970. Land planning research project, S. S. Skjei, Project Director.	S. S. Skjei, fo School of Arc Planning, Princ presently, Ass Department o University of Charlottesville
195 Program development of a statewide learning opportunities program for disadvantaged young adults, Board of Education, State of Illinois.	D. Hanson, Pro and Architectu Center for Urb University of I Chicago, Illino
207 Plan for a community museum to be developed by the community; served in advisory capacity.	T. Mitchell, Mi Eye Opener Metropolitan M New York, Ne

roject	Respondent
ning,	C. C. McRanen, Evaluation Manager Department of Model Cities San Antonio, Texas
ars in zen	C. Lieder, Assistant Professor School of Social Work and Community Planning University of Maryland Baltimore, Maryland
Directorate Urban	F. P. Swiss, Urban Planner CORDS/UP APO, San Francisco, California

oject	Respondent
pment ures manual.	H. Patterson, President Patterson & Probst, Inc. Chicago, Illinois
ook for the rograms.	C. Bee, Instructor, Research Associate School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York

Miscellaneous

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
41 Planning and zoning: center commercial district rezoning, city of Plantation. Urban renewal: demountable office project for little HUD.	H. S. Krusé, Architect, Planner, Teacher Watson, Deutschman & Krusé Miami, Florida
43 **Princeton University Land Planning and Housing Potentials: A Preliminary Assessment,** Lance Jay Brown, Project Director, Princeton University School of Architecture and Urban Planning, October 1970: Research into industrial development (strip-type) catalogue types; Expansion of housing site planning catalogue.	S. G. Saunders, Jr., formerly Graduate Student and Research Assistant Princeton University School of Architecture and Urban Planning; presently, Architectural Designer Milton C. Harry & Associates, Architects 4100 North Miami Avenue Miami, Florida
117 Planning for Massachusetts General Hospital with Davis, Brody & Associates, New York City.	B. P. Spring, Dean School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York
162 **Princeton University Land Planning and Housing Potentials: A Preliminary Assessment,** Lance Jay Brown, Project Director, Princeton University School of Architecture and Urban Planning, October 197[illegible] Land planning research project, S. S. Skjei, Project Director.	S. S. Skjei, formerly, Assistant Professor School of Architecture and Urban Planning, Princeton University; presently, Assistant Professor Department of Environmental Sciences University of Virginia Charlottesville, Virginia
195 Program development of a statewide learning opportunities program for disadvantaged young adults, Board of Education, State of Illinois.	D. Hanson, Professor of Urban Science and Architecture Center for Urban Studies University of Illinois Chicago, Illinois
207 Plan for a community museum to be developed by the community; served in advisory capacity.	T. Mitchell, Manager Eye Opener Metropolitan Museum of Art New York, New York

Miscellaneous (continued)

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
237 Pastoral plan for the Diocese of Natchez, Jackson, Mississippi.	A. J. Cavataio, Deputy Chief HEW/SRS/OPRT/ORD/R&D Washington, D.C.
268 Industrial planning: industrial opportunity study, Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan.	J. P. Melin, President Consultantgroup, Ltd. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada
284 Various redevelopment projects, Plainfield.	R. De Niscia, Renewal Coordinator City of Plainfield Plainfield, New Jersey

A.5

New Applications of Workbook Method or Materials

Question 8: Have you used the Workbook method, outline, or tools in any new way, that is, applied to different types of problems than those discussed in the Workbook?

The following is a sampling of new ways in which the Workbook method, outiine or materials have been used by recipients. The list was compiled from the answers to the above question and does not cover other comments on the questionnaire which often parallel this listing.

Citizen Participation

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
9 Developing citizen participation approach for comprehensive planning.	F. Sortelli, Assistant Planning Director Planning Division, Department of Community Development Tucson, Arizona
16 Designing an advisory committee book for citizen use.	J. H. Deutsch, City Planner Community Redevelopment Agency Los Angeles, California
31 Consulting with a black group in rehabilitation housing.	C. A. Ahlstrom, Principal Ahlstrom & Lee, Architects New Haven, Connecticut
38 Setting up requirements which would provide for community participation in HUD programs.	C. E. Thomsen, Special Assistant for Design Policy Department of Housing and Urban Development Washington, D.C.
59 Construction of 32-foot square, color-coded, land use model, made to be worked upon, for better understanding by citizens of the community.	W. L. Coco, Director City-Parish Beautification Committee Baton Rouge, Louisiana
154 An open space study, El Paso, Texas.	D. B. Stanley, Architect Citizens Committee on Open Space El Paso, Texas
243 Developing comprehensive plan by involving citizens and using the Workbook as a tool to get citizen inputs.	K. M. Husain, Senior Planner City Planning Department City of Fort Worth Fort Worth, Texas
246 Used by advisors in self-help housing project.	R. Daru, Research Architect Environmental Workshop Bouwcentrum Rotterdam, Netherlands
258 Functions of citizen participation group in Model Cities program, Lawton.	R. E. Brown, Assistant Director of Evaluation Lawton Model Cities Department Lawton, Oklahoma

Education Orientation

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
96 Illustration and example in teaching. Example of attempt to secure direct participation in design process; example of organization of reference material for this purpose.	Heath Lickli Architecture Princeton U Princeton, N
117 Thesis outline preparation.	B. P. Spring, School of A Environmen The City Co of New York New York, N
118 Reference in an architecture design course.	C. Bee, Instr School of A Environmen The City Co of New York New York, N
195 As a model for other issues in community development and educational programs.	D. Hanson, I and Architec Center for U University o Chicago, Illi
202 Reference and guide for incoming staff and students needing orientation.	Robin Riley Metro Link, New Orleans
280 Used in housing-design projects. 'Every job has a different conceptual idea, so the outline becomes just a guide.'	M. Chosycze Department University o Gainesville,

project	Respondent
ticipation planning.	F. Sortelli, Assistant Planning Director Planning Division, Department of Community Development Tucson, Arizona
committee	J. H. Deutsch, City Planner Community Redevelopment Agency Los Angeles, California
k group in	C. A. Ahlstrom, Principal Ahlstrom & Lee, Architects New Haven, Connecticut
nts which ty partici-	C. E. Thomsen, Special Assistant for Design Policy Department of Housing and Urban Development Washington, D.C.
ot square, , made to understanding y.	W. L. Coco, Director City-Parish Beautification Committee Baton Rouge, Louisiana
El Paso, Texas.	D. B. Stanley, Architect Citizens Committee on Open Space El Paso, Texas
nsive plan by the Workbook s.	K. M. Husain, Senior Planner City Planning Department City of Fort Worth Fort Worth, Texas
lf-help housing	R. Daru, Research Architect Environmental Workshop Bouwcentrum Rotterdam, Netherlands
articipation am, Lawton.	R. E. Brown, Assistant Director of Evaluation Lawton Model Cities Department Lawton, Oklahoma

Education Orientation

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
96 Illustration and example in teaching. Example of attempt to secure direct participation in design process; example of organization of reference material for this purpose.	Heath Licklider, Professor of Architecture and Urban Planning Princeton University Princeton, New Jersey
117 Thesis outline preparation.	B. P. Spring, Dean School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York
118 Reference in an architecture design course.	C. Bee, Instructor and Research Associate School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York
195 As a model for other issues in community development and educational programs.	D. Hanson, Professor of Urban Science and Architecture Center for Urban Studies University of Illinois Chicago, Illinois
202 Reference and guide for incoming staff and students needing orientation.	Robin Riley, Executive Director Metro Link, Community Design Center New Orleans, Louisiana
280 Used in housing-design projects. 'Every job has a different conceptual idea, so the outline becomes just a guide.'	M. Chosyczer, Student Department of Architecture University of Florida Gainesville, Florida

Educational Facilities Planning

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
116 Planning of educational facilities for a school district on Long Island.	C. B. Zucker, Research Architect School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York
120 Evaluating and comparing relocatable school facilities (part of thesis project).	E. Nivin, Student School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York
176 Planning and design of student union buildings.	B. Moore Cambridge Seven Associates, Inc. Cambridge, Massachusetts
206 Planning of proposed new elementary and/or secondary school in the District.	R. L. Fraissinet, Chairman Citizens Advisory Committee to Board of Education, Union Free School District No. 12 Malverne, New York

Guidelines

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
3 As prototype for a similar set of guidelines.	D. Procos, Assi School of Arch Nova Scotia Te Halifax, Nova S
50 Used to write guides and procedures manual for the Illinois Housing Development Authority.	H. Patterson, P Patterson & Pr Chicago, Illino
117 Used in preparing an outline for the design proposal of a new neighborhood near Moscow, U.S.S.R., by Davis, Brody & Associates, Architects, New York City.	B. P. Spring, D School of Arch Environmental The City Colle University of N New York, Nev
118 Used in developing a basis for a building evaluation method.	C. Bee, Instruct School of Arch Environmental The City Colle University of N New York, Nev

ject	Respondent
facilities sland.	C. B. Zucker, Research Architect School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York
g re- of	E. Nivin, Student School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York
tudent	B. Moore Cambridge Seven Associates, Inc. Cambridge, Massachusetts
w ele- ool in	R. L. Fraissinet, Chairman Citizens Advisory Committee to Board of Education, Union Free School District No. 12 Malverne, New York

Guidelines

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
3 As prototype for a similar set of guidelines.	D. Procos, Assistant Professor School of Architecture Nova Scotia Technical College Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada
50 Used to write guides and procedures manual for the Illinois Housing Development Authority.	H. Patterson, President Patterson & Probst, Inc. Chicago, Illinois
117 Used in preparing an outline for t design proposal of a new neighborhood near Moscow, U.S.S.R., by Davis, Brody & Associates, Architects, New York City.	B. P. Spring, Dean School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York
118 Used in developing a basis for a building evaluation method.	C. Bee, Instructor, Research Assistant School of Architecture and Environmental Studies The City College of the City University of New York New York, New York

Professional Applications

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
37 Used for a graphic description of housing densities to architecture clients.	T. Oldham, Architect Skidmore, Owings & Merrill Washington, D.C.
106 Made use of the analytical procedure for different social science.	D. L. Paul, President Paul Properties Great Neck, New York
158 Used in programming work for architecture projects.	P. Kinnison, Jr., Architect San Antonio, Texas
268 Industrial development.	J. P. Melin, President Consultantgroup, Ltd. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada

Reference

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
64 Used as a guide in site development studies.	R. White, Ar Boston, Mass
84 Used in preparing a general development plan for a fringe area.	R. C. Krier, U City of Roch Rochester, M
(The above represent a sampling in this category)	

Research

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
174 Used in developing a methodology for urban development analyses.	R. Sangine, Architect Skidmore, Owings & Merrill Washington, D.C.

Other Uses

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
121 Simulation of nonhousing schematics.	J. Gaffney, A Lawrence Ha New York, N
230 Used in a community survey of a 55 square-mile rural and suburban area to help define citizen priorities.	K. Jones, Ass Pierce Count Tacoma, Was
233 Influenced by the illustrations to make presentations more 'visible'.	J. Entress, U Transportati Dayton, Ohi

roject	Respondent
cription of ture clients.	T. Oldham, Architect Skidmore, Owings & Merrill Washington, D.C.
ical pro- ience.	D. L. Paul, President Paul Properties Great Neck, New York
work for	P. Kinnison, Jr., Architect San Antonio, Texas
t.	J. P. Melin, President Consultantgroup, Ltd. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada

Reference

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
64 Used as a guide in site development studies.	R. White, Architect Boston, Massachusetts
84 Used in preparing a general development plan for a fringe area.	R. C. Krier, Long-Range Planner City of Rochester Rochester, Minnesota
(The above represent a sampling in this category)	

project	Respondent
nethodology yses.	R. Sangine, Architect Skidmore, Owings & Merrill Washington, D.C.

Other Uses

Questionnaire number and project	Respondent
121 Simulation of nonhousing schematics.	J. Gaffney, Architect Lawrence Halprin Associates New York, New York
230 Used in a community survey of a 55 square-mile rural and suburban area to help define citizen priorities.	K. Jones, Assistant Director Pierce County Planning Department Tacoma, Washington
233 Influenced by the illustrations to make presentations more 'visible'.	J. Entress, Urban Planner Transportation Coordinating Committee Dayton, Ohio

A.6

Suggested Materials of Interest

The Workbook bibliography (Other Books You May Want to Use) was well received, only a few negative comments being made by respondents. Some respondents requested that it be expanded, additional materials were suggested, and the need for a general and continuous updating was cited.

Listed below are publications recommended by respondents and material suggested by the authors of this report.

Advocacy Planning for Urban Development: With Analysis of Six Demonstration Programs. Earl M. Blecher. Praeger, 111 Fourth Avenue, New York, New York 10003. 1971. 180 pp. $12.50.

Advocate Planning: Origin, Evaluation, Alternatives, and Implications for Urban Planning Education. Robert Heifetz. Doctoral dissertation; Division of Urban Planning, School of Architecture, Columbia University. Listed in: **Urban Research Inventory, New York City, Supplement,** Vol.1:No.1, 1969. p. 87.

CDC News. Community Services Department, The American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. First issue published in 1971.

'Charrette: A Real Way to Learn.' Marvin E. Rosenman. In: **Journal of the American Institute of Architects,** Vol.56:1, July 1971, p. 48. (Discusses the 8-day charrette hosted by the city of Indianapolis; the charrette project was a proposed elementary school to be constructed in the Model Cities area. Residents of the study area, educators, planners, architects, engineers, economists
ness representatives, federal, state and
and students participated in an intens
ity problems to come up with solutio
the desires of the community.)

Citizen Participation in Urban Develo
Hans B. C. Spiegel, NTL Institute for
Science, National Education Associat
N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. 1968
$5.95 each. (Vol.1: Concepts and Issu
and Programs.)

Community Design Directory. Comm
tory of the Massachusetts Institute of
Architecture and Urban Planning, Ca
June 1971. 317 pp. $7.00. (Part I: Si
Community Planning; II: Directory o
Materials.)

Coordination of Public and Private Fo
and Shoreland Management. Inland L
River Watershed Council, 415 West W
Michigan 48103. 1971. 4 pp. mimeo.

Educational Activity Planning: Work
the Citizens' Advisory Committee Pla
Board of Education, Union Free Sch
Malverne, Long Island by the Urban
School of Architecture and Environm
College of the City University of New
New York 10038. 3 November 1970.

Suggested Materials of Interest

The Workbook bibliography (Other Books You May Want to Use) was well received, only a few negative comments being made by respondents. Some respondents requested that it be expanded, additional materials were suggested, and the need for a general and continuous updating was cited.

Listed below are publications recommended by respondents and material suggested by the authors of this report.

Advocacy Planning for Urban Development: With Analysis of Six Demonstration Programs. Earl M. Blecher. Praeger, 111 Fourth Avenue, New York, New York 10003. 1971. 180 pp. $12.50.

Advocate Planning: Origin, Evaluation, Alternatives, and Implications for Urban Planning Education. Robert Heifetz. Doctoral dissertation; Division of Urban Planning, School of Architecture, Columbia University. Listed in: **Urban Research Inventory, New York City, Supplement,** Vol.1:No.1, 1969. p. 87.

CDC News. Community Services Department, The American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. First issue published in 1971.

'Charrette: A Real Way to Learn.' Marvin E. Rosenman. In: **Journal of the American Institute of Architects,** Vol.56:1, July 1971, p. 48. (Discusses the 8-day charrette hosted by the city of Indianapolis; the charrette project was a proposed elementary school to be constructed in the Model Cities area. Residents of the study area, educators, planners, architects, engineers, economists, psychologists, business representatives, federal, state and local public officials, and students participated in an intensive study of community problems to come up with solutions to fit the needs and the desires of the community.)

Citizen Participation in Urban Development. Edited by Hans B. C. Spiegel, NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, National Education Association, 1201 16th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. 1968-1969. 2 volumes. $5.95 each. (Vol.1: Concepts and Issues; Vol.2: Cases and Programs.)

Community Design Directory. Community Projects Laboratory of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, School of Architecture and Urban Planning, Cambridge, Massachusetts. June 1971. 317 pp. $7.00. (Part I: Signs and Designs in Community Planning; II: Directory of People, Projects, and Materials.)

Coordination of Public and Private Forces on Inland Lake and Shoreland Management. Inland Lakes Project, Huron River Watershed Council, 415 West Washington, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103. 1971. 4 pp. mimeo.

Educational Activity Planning: Work Report. Prepared for the Citizens' Advisory Committee Planning Group for the Board of Education, Union Free School District No. 12, Malverne, Long Island by the Urban Research Group, School of Architecture and Environmental Design, The City College of the City University of New York, New York City, New York 10038. 3 November 1970. Unpaged.

Emerging Methods in Environmental Design and Planning: Proceedings of the Design Methods Group First International Conference. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142. 1970. 409 pp. $22.50.

'The Evolution of a Place to Dwell.' Chapter in forthcoming book by Hanno Weber, School of Architecture and Urban Planning, Princeton University. (George Street urban renewal proposal by the Urban League of Greater New Brunswick, New Jersey.)

Guide to Federal Low- and Moderate-Income Housing and Community Development Programs. The National Urban Coalition, 2100 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037. Third edition, August 1, 1971. 30 pp. + appendices. Single copies are free; bulk rate 50 cents per copy for over 10 copies.

Guidelines for Housing Development. Donald Hanson, Center for Urban Studies, University of Illinois at Chicago Campus, Chicago, Illinois 60680.

Handbook on Housing Law. National Housing and Development Law Project, Earl Warren Legal Institute, University of California. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. 1970. 2 volumes and supplements. $49.95. (Vol.1: Guide to Federal Housing, Redevelopment and Planning Programs; Vol.2: Landlord-Tenant Materials.)

Home Ownership for Low-Income Families. Henry King Burgwyn. Community Development Group, School of Design, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina. Published by the N.C. Agricultural Extension Service. July 1970. 40 pp.

Housing and Planning References. Library, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. 70 cents single copy; subscription price $4 per year. (A bi-monthly subject index to publications received by the HUD Library.)

Housing and Planning Terms Commonly Used–and Misused. Compiled by Marvin Markus. Citizens Housing and Planning Council of New York, Inc., 20 West 40th Street, New York, New York 10018. 1971. 38 pp. $1.00.

Housing Proposal for the Community Involvement Corporation (COINCO). Prepared by The People's Workshop, 130 Bayard Street, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901 [now at 66 Witherspoon Street, Princeton, New Jersey 08540] . 1970. Var.paged.

Housing Systems Proposals for Operation Breakthrough. Prepared by the Building Research Advisory Board of the National Academy of Sciences for U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. 1971. ix+590 pp. $5.25. (Presents the technical description of those housing systems proposals submitted in response to HUD's Request for Proposals which have been released for publication by the proposer.)

How to Conduct a Community Action Meeting. New Jersey Community Action Training Institute, 2465 South Broad Street, Trenton, New Jersey 08610. January 1968. 20 pp.

HUD Newsletter. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Published weekly. Subscription rate: $1.50 per year, domestic; $2.00 foreign.

Inland Lakes: Analysis and Action. Inland Lakes Project, Huron River Watershed Council, 415 West Washington, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103. 1971. 32 pp.

Inland Lakes: Reference Handbook. Jerome K. Fulton, E. Wayne Say, Thomas E. Bletcher. Inland Lakes Project, Huron River Watershed Council, 415 West Washington, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103. August 1971. 41 pp.

Land Planning Tools Users Manual. Michael Heiberg. Environmental Systems Research Institute, 14 North Fifth Street, Redlands, California 92373. April 1970. 55 pp. $4.00.

Law Manual for Community Developers and Organizers. Thomas Grippando and Arthur Scheller. For information on how to obtain the Manual contact: Thomas Grippando, 116 S. Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60680. 1971. Var.paged. (This Manual is a product of the Law Program for Community Organization sponsored by DePaul University, Community Legal Counsel, Illinois Board of Higher Education and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.)

'Legislating the Urban Design Process.' William Weismantel. In: **Urban Law Annual,** 1970, pp. 196-230. $5.00.

Low-Cost Homes...Through Group Action. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C. 20410. 1967. 23 pp.

Making the City Observable. Richard S. Wurman. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142. 1971. 96 pp. $3.95, paper.

'Michigan's Citizen Participation Statute.' Phillip Rhodes. In: **Urban Law Annual,** 1970, pp. 231-236. $5.00.

The Model Cities Program: A History and Analysis of the Planning Process in Three Cities: Atlanta, Georgia; Seattle, Washington; Dayton, Ohio. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. May 1969. 93 pp. $1.00.

Neighborhood Power and Control: Implications for Urban Planning. Hans B. Spiegel and Stephen D. Mittenthal. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C. 1968. x,180 columns. Price not indicated.

A Pattern Language Which Generates Multi-Service Centers. Christopher Alexander, Sara Ishikawa, and Murray Silverstein. Center for Environmental Structure, 2531 Etna Street, Berkeley, California 94704. 1968. 283 pp. Price not indicated.

Planning: The Architects' Handbook. S. Rowland Pierce, Patrick Cutbush and Anthony Williams. Iliffe Books, Ltd., London, England. 1969. 8th edition revised. 568 pp. Price not indicated.

Precoordination–Basis for Industrialized Building. Edited by Russell W. Smith, Jr. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards. Building Science Series 32. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. January 1971. 131 pp. $1.50. (Proceedings of a conference held September 24-26, 1969, under the auspices of the American National Standard Institute's Committee A62, Precoordination of Building Components and Systems, sponsored by the National Bureau of Standards.)

Princeton University, Land Planning and Housing Potentials: A Preliminary Assessment. Lance Jay Brown, project director; Dorothy E. Whiteman, editor. Princeton University, School of Architecture and Urban Planning, Princeton, New Jersey 08540. October 1970. 239 pp. (Limited printing.)

Problem Seeking. William M. Pena and John W. Focke. Caudill Rowlett Scott, 1111 West Loop South, Houston, Texas 77027. 1969. 40 pp.

Project Area Committee: The Voice and Action of Citizens. Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles, 727 West 7th Street, Los Angeles, California 90017. 1971. II pp. mimeo.

Queen of Angels Housing Education Program. Harry L. Hines with editorial assistance. Queen of Angels Catholic Church, 44 Belmont Avenue, Newark, New Jersey 07103. 1972. 67 pp. (Forthcoming booklet designed for community people to be used in conjunction with slides, lectures, and field trips. Includes a glossary selected from various published works.)

Social Innovation in the City: New Enterprises for Community Development. Edited by Richard S. Rosenbloom and Robin Marris. Published by Harvard University Program on Technology and Society. Distributed by Harvard University Press, 79 Garden Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. 1969. 200 pp. $4.00. (A collection of working papers by the Research Group on Technology, Business, and the City, Harvard University Program on Technology and Society.)

Three Proposals for School District Development. Prepared for the Citizens' Advisory Committee Planning Group for the Board of Education, Union Free School District No. 12, Nassau County, New York, by the Urban Research Group, School of Architecture and Environmental Design, The City College of the City University of New York, New York, New York 10038. 9 December 1970. Unpaged.

Urban Dwelling Environments: An Elementary Survey of Settlements for the Study of Design Determinants. Horacio Caminos, John F. C. Turner, and John A. Steffian. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142. 1969. 242 pp. $17.50; loose sheets, $15.00.

Urban Law Annual. School of Law, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri 63130. $5.00.

'Urban Renewal in DeSoto-Carr: Citizen Participation Comes of Age.' Jeffrey D. Buchanan. In: **Urban Law Annual**, 1970, pp. 103-132. $5.00.

Urban Research Inventory, New York City. Compiled and edited by Office of University Relations, Office of the Mayor, 250 Broadway, New York, New York 10007. Vol.1:No.1, 1969. 118 pp. Supplement, Vo.1:No.1, 1969, 122 pp. (The 1971 edition of the Inventory is available in 15 individual subject volumes--No.11, Urban Planning and Housing, $2.00--and a comprehensive library edition, $30.)

The Whole Earth Catalog. Published by Portolo Institute, Menlo Park, California 94025. First issue, Fall 1968; final issue, 1971, 447 pp. $5.00.

Bibliographies:

Citizen and Business Participation in Urban Affairs: A Bibliography. Compiled by the Library, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. February 1970. 84 pp. 75 cents.

Citizen Participation: A Review of the Literature. Judith V. May. Council of Planning Librarians Exchange Bibliography 210-211. Council of Planning Librarians, P.O. Box 229, Monticello, Illinois 61856. August 1971. 82 pp. $8.00.

Comprehensive Urban Planning: A Selective Annotated Bibliography with Related Materials. Melville C. Branch. Sage Publications, Inc., 275 South Beverly Drive, Beverly Hills, California 90212. 1970. 477 pp. $20.

Housing, Renewal and Development Bibliography. William L. C. Wheaton, William C. Baer, and David M. Vetter. Council of Planning Librarians Exchange Bibliography 46. Council of Planning Librarians, P.O. Box 229, Monticello, Illinois 61856. April 1968. 44 pp. $4.50.

Neighborhood Conservation and Property Rehabilitation: A Bibliography. Compiled by the Library, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. 1969. 78 pp. 70 cents.

Operation Breakthrough, Mass Produced and Industrialized Housing: A Bibliography. Compiled by the Library, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. May 1970. 72 pp. 70 cents.

Urban Affairs Bibliography: A Guide to Literature in the Field. A. Lee Fritschler, B. Douglas Harman, and Bernard H. Ross. The School of Government and Public Administration, The American University, Massachusetts and Nebraska Avenues, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20016. Second edition, 1970. 94 pp. $2.00.

Urban Outlook: A Selected Bibliography of Films, Filmstrips, Slides, and Audiotapes. Compiled by U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. June 1969. 38 pp. 45 cents.

A.7

Summary Description of the Planning and Design Workbook for Community Participation, **Prepared by Bernard P. Spring**

Background

In 1966, a group was formed at the Princeton University School of Architecture to do research on design methods in a new way. We planned to base our research work upon our own experiences with a program of community action. We began as 'advocate planners' for community groups in Newark, New Jersey, following a model for professional assistance that was, by then, well established. Our staff would provide professional services and strategies for community groups that could not afford to hire architects or planners, groups that saw physical change in their neighborhood as having a high priority. In Newark, such organizations were not hard to find.

We discovered that advocacy planning done on the old, familiar model simply did not work. Even groups with considerable political experience and sophistication were not willing or able to enter into the inner workings of the programming and design process with us. And we did not then know enough about the fundamental structure of these processes to prompt nonprofessionals into making decisions on their own behalf. We were told about community aspirations in broad, general terms and expected to go back to our office to produce a set of presentation drawings of an attractive finished product. This we did. For example, our drawings of a low-rise, medium-density housing area replete with community facilities and indigenous commercial development were much admired by the community groups, city and federal agencies.

But then, as it always does in the cour
might take three to five years to comp
political situation shifted and our proj
available to the sponsoring group. All
had) to show for our joint efforts was
drawings. The members of the group h
about the planning and design process
their proposal to the changing politica
seed money funds were used up in the
first scheme. They could not afford to
cess to meet the new context.

It was as a result of this kind of experi
focus of our efforts to the creation of
professionals. In the following two ye
relationship with community groups.
finished plans, we designed a process.
plained in the 592-page loose leaf, ope
document called **Planning and Design
Community Participation.**

Use

Before it was printed, the first vers
process was tested by one of the M de
Councils in New Jersey. Most of our e
firmed. Our process could be followed
preciated by people with limited form
those who had no previous experience
design. Although the printed version o
focused on making decisions about ho

Summary Description of the Planning and Design Workbook for Community Participation, **Prepared by Bernard P. Spring**

Background

In 1966, a group was formed at the Princeton University School of Architecture to do research on design methods in a new way. We planned to base our research work upon our own experiences with a program of community action. We began as 'advocate planners' for community groups in Newark, New Jersey, following a model for professional assistance that was, by then, well established. Our staff would provide professional services and strategies for community groups that could not afford to hire architects or planners, groups that saw physical change in their neighborhood as having a high priority. In Newark, such organizations were not hard to find.

We discovered that advocacy planning done on the old, familiar model simply did not work. Even groups with considerable political experience and sophistication were not willing or able to enter into the inner workings of the programming and design process with us. And we did not then know enough about the fundamental structure of these processes to prompt nonprofessionals into making decisions on their own behalf. We were told about community aspirations in broad, general terms and expected to go back to our office to produce a set of presentation drawings of an attractive finished product. This we did. For example, our drawings of a low-rise, medium-density housing area replete with community facilities and indigenous commercial development were much admired by the community groups, city and federal agencies.

But then, as it always does in the course of a project that might take three to five years to complete (at best), the political situation shifted and our project site was no longer available to the sponsoring group. All the group had (or we had) to show for our joint efforts was a handsome set of drawings. The members of the group had not learned enough about the planning and design process to be able to adjust their proposal to the changing political situation. And their seed money funds were used up in the production of the first scheme. They could not afford to repeat the same process to meet the new context.

It was as a result of this kind of experience that we shifted the focus of our efforts to the creation of a workbook for nonprofessionals. In the following two years we continued our relationship with community groups. But instead of producing finished plans, we designed a process. This process is explained in the 592-page loose leaf, open-ended working document called **Planning and Design Workbook for Community Community Participation.**

Use

Before it was printed, the first version of the Workbook process was tested by one of the Model Cities Community Councils in New Jersey. Most of our expectations were confirmed. Our process could be followed, understood and appreciated by people with limited formal education and by those who had no previous experience with planning and design. Although the printed version of the Workbook was focused on making decisions about housing and related

community services by disadvantaged groups, we gradually became aware of additional potential uses.

For one thing, the book constituted a functional definition, in considerable detail, of a design method. Not necessarily an entirely **new** design method, however. Many of the steps in the method we described have been used by planners and architects for some years. But as far as we know, the steps have never before been grouped and interrelated as shown in the Workbook nor have the steps been made quite as explicit as they are in the Workbook. Also, we found that the Workbook functioned well as a training aid and text for paraprofessionals and professionals in planning and design.

Even for those who want to or are forced to follow a more intuitive, randomly organized design process, the Workbook was found to be useful in some important ways. It could be used to keep track, after the fact, of the kinds of planning and design decisions that were being made. Keeping track in such cases is more than a bureaucratic exercise. It prevents the omission of crucial decisions and provides a format for public accountability. Today, it is important for even the most gifted and effective intuitive planners and designers to have a record of their decisions for public agencies, public hearings and the varied, competing interest groups in the open arena of politics.

And finally, we found that the Workbook approach could be easily adapted to any kind of planning and design problem which required participation and policy-making by nonprofessionals. For example, if a group of fifty millionaires wanted to plan a country club for themselves, they would find the Workbook approach most helpful in clarifying what was wanted and resolving inevitable differences of opinion. The Workbook is not a design method that is limited to particular building types or socio-economic groups. The Urban Research Group at The City College's School of Architecture and Environmental Studies is currently applying the method to a system of parks in New York City, a public school district in Nassau County, and to a large State University.

The Design Method

The Workbook approach is most succinctly described in the ten 'steps' listed in the instructions to the user. These are not, however, 'steps' in the usual sense, but an array of behaviors. The instructions make it clear that, as in most real-world decision-making processes, the steps can be taken in any order (depending on the interests and knowledge of the participants); several or all of them may be carried out simultaneously; and, perhaps most important of all, each one will probably have to be repeated several times before a final decision is made.

There are three basic types of operation embodied in the method. The first is an open-ended verbal process of defining issues, policies, possible results of policies and priorities among selected policies. The second operation involves the traditional designers' exploration of the kinds of physical forms that might satisfy the policies and priorities which were stated verbally. Finally, there is a rigorous method described for the evaluation of proposals for physical change. The complexity and controversial nature of public planning and design today make the evaluation steps the key to the usefulness of the method.

The ten steps are described as follows:

Step 1: Determine Issues
What problems do you want to work on?

Step 2: Decide on Policies
What actions do you want to take to solve the problems?

Step 3: Set Priorities
How important is each of the actions you want to take?

Step 4: Select Catalog Types
How have other groups tried to solve the kinds of problems you are working on?

Step 5: Prepare a Plan
How do you want to change the physical make-up of your community and its component parts?

Step 6: Analyze Your Plan
How well does the plan you have made meet the policies and priorities you have decided upon?

Step 7: Prepare Alternative Plans
Are there any other kinds of plans that may be better than the first one you prepared?

Step 8: Evaluate the Alternative Plans
How well does each one of the plans you have made accomplish what you want to do?

Step 9: Select a Plan
What plan does your group agree to support?

Step 10: Prepare a Report
How do you tell the people who will help you accomplish your plan what you have decided to do?

Working Materials

For the most part, the 592 pages of the Workbook are made up of the working materials people will need to perform all of the steps listed above. The principal kinds of materials provided also fall into three basic categories: verbal instructions that allow the preparation of an explicit planning and design program (in language that can be used directly as criteria for evaluation of proposals); material that allows laymen to experiment with variations of physical form during the course of a public meeting; and finally, charts and tally sheets that are used in the evaluation process.

The information used in the development of a written program appears in two forms. Matters of choice are presented as samples of issues with the range of policy choices usually possible in dealing with the issue and, in addition, a brief prediction of the possible results to various interest groups if any one of the policies is selected. A unique aspect of this method is the use of the 'existing policy' as one of the policy choices displayed for each issue. Thus, information on existing conditions is brought into the decision-making process only if it is relevant to a policy choice. This eliminates the often obfuscating process of collecting every piece of data available as the first step in the planning process. A second aspect of the written program consists of requirements which are not matters of choice but are mandated by laws or cultural patterns that are not challenged by any interest group. These requirements are listed as 'user standards' in language that may also be used as a set of criteria for evaluation of physical plans.

The working tools for creating physical designs in many variations during a public meeting are adapted to the scale and scope of the problems being dealt with. In the first version of the Workbook a separate volume and a different kind of physical planning device was used for decisions on the scale of a) the neighborhood, b) the housing site, and c) the dwelling unit itself. We discovered that laymen could not begin to use these devices for modeling and arranging physical form until they reviewed the catalog of prototypes that the typical professional carries with him in his head as a result of years of education and experience. We were determined to make such catalogs of design prototypes explicit in the form of diagrams, plans, perspectives and photographs for the use of nonprofessionals. The creation of catalogs was probably the most intellectually demanding aspect of the work done in preparing the Workbook.

The refinement of the catalogs and of all the other types of working materials used in the Workbook method is a continuing effort on the part of the staff of the Urban Research Group at the School of Architecture and Environmental Studies at City College. As was expected from the outset, we have been engaged in further field testing of the process and making constant revisions and additions to the first published version of the book.

A.7.a

Reviews of the Planning and Design Workbook for Community Participation

Reviews of the Workbook appear in the following journals:

Architectural Forum, Vol.131:No.5, December 1969, pp. 32-39. Critical review by John Morris Dixon. A number of illustrations that appear in the publication are reproduced to complement the text.

Architectural & Engineering News, Vol.11:No.12, December 1969, p. 73.

Community, Vol.3:No.2, November 1969, p. 6.

Journal of Housing, Vol.27:No.5, May-June 1970, p. 262.

Progressive Architecture, Vol.51:No.4, April 1970, pp. 148, 184. Reviewed by Percival Goodman.

Quarterly Digest of Urban and Regional Research, Vol.17: No.1, Spring 1970, p. 111.

Urban Research News, Vol.4:No.1, November 10, 1969, p. 4.